

broad outlines and many of its specific provisions, this year's administration bill is very similar to that which was debated, modified, and ultimately passed by the House last year.

There is, however, one significant exception. The administration, unfortunately, did not see fit to include in this year's draft legislation any form of preventive relief to preclude interference with freedom of speech, assembly, or petition in relation to civil rights. I am today introducing a bill fill this gap.

The bill which I am offering today is identical to title III of H.R. 14765, the civil rights bill of 1966, as reported on June 30, 1966, by the House Judiciary Committee. This title would provide an avenue of injunctive relief, through civil action, in two types of instances:

First. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws on account of such person's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

Second. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deny or hinder another in the exercise of his lawful right to speak, assemble, petition, or otherwise express himself for the purpose of securing recognition of or protection for equal enjoyment of guaranteed and protected rights free from discrimination.

In such instances, the bill would authorize a person, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, to institute a civil action or other proceeding in the U.S. district courts for temporary or permanent preventive relief; including restraining orders or injunctions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is in accord with a line of legislative proposals which have been discussed on both sides of the Capitol for a full decade. As part III, this approach was offered during the Eisenhower administration and was passed by the House in 1957. As title III, it was debated during our consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As the Lindsay amendment, it was offered during floor debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Again as title III, this proposal was introduced early last year by approximately 20 Members of the House, accepted by Judiciary Committee as an addition to H.R. 14765, and passed by the House as an important part of that omnibus bill.

In advancing this proposal, the committee and the House have recognized its importance as a complement to the Federal criminal laws which punish violations of civil rights. Title III would give every American the assurance that he has a course of action to prevent such violations, and to guarantee that he may exercise his first amendment rights in advocating equal rights free from violence, intimidation, interference or the threat of interference. This bill would also give our law enforcement officers a new tool with which to prevent violence,

protect American citizens, and maintain civil order.

I trust that the House Judiciary Committee, in considering the administration's civil rights package of 1967, will continue the precedent set in 1966 and will again seek to improve our legislative guarantees of equal rights by reporting title III.

FATE OF POWELL TO BE DECIDED BY HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY

(Mr. RUPPE (at the request of Mr. Gude) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday we will be called upon to decide the fate of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. There is no question but what POWELL misused public funds and has acted in a grossly irresponsible manner. The facts of the Powell case have been carefully developed by a special House committee, and that committee has recommended severe punishment.

The American press has thrust the Powell case into the forefront of America's attention. Before POWELL came the strange case of Bobby Baker, and the allegations and investigation of U.S. Senator THOMAS DONN. All of this has culminated in a deep suspicion by the American people of their elected representatives.

I firmly believe that the great majority of Congressmen and Senators are honest and of the highest integrity. But the fact remains that the actions of a few have cast doubt on the entire legislative branch of our Government. If we punish ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—and go no further—we have done little to repair the sagging reputation of Congress. It is my sincere hope that the Powell investigation will culminate in the establishment of a Standing Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee must have the power to investigate charges of official misconduct against any Member of the House of Representatives, and must have the authority to recommend corrective measures to the House concerning that Member. Only through such a committee can we begin to repair the reputation of the House of Representatives.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

(Mr. LUKENS (at the request of Mr. Gude) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally.

Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to, first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth held by them, their spouses or any staff members making more than \$15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government; and fourth make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this kind of "gesture of honorability" is desperately required at this time in our history.

The "credibility gap"—with regard to the conduct of Congressmen, has not grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue—it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of leftwing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime in the streets—to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (at the request of Mr. Gude) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PORR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

February 27, 1967

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, as Government grows, the identity and majesty of the individual citizen shrinks.

This terrible truth, and the urge to temper it, was at the root of the Administrative Procedure Act adopted by the Congress in 1946.

In the two decades which have elapsed since then, Government has grown in size and power more than ever before in a similar period. The time has come to make adjustments, take up the slack and elevate the citizen's posture to defend his rights in conflicts with Government. It is time to modernize the Administrative Procedure Act. This is the purpose of the bill I have introduced today.

There are many reasons for the dramatic increase in citizen-Government conflicts. Growth in the private sector has complicated life and compounded frictions; in the last 20 years the gross national product has tripled. Scientific and technological changes have brought a new sophistication to old disputes. In 1946, atomic energy, television and electronics were in their infancy. The communications and transportation industries were on a threshold no one fully appreciated. Space exploration was only dreamed of.

Those who wrote the original law in 1946 hardly anticipated demographic developments this generation of Americans has witnessed. Better fuel, food, clothing, shelter, and medicine have prolonged the life-expectancy, and with the help of greater immigration, America's population has increased by 45 million. Population is not only greater but it has become increasingly concentrated in urban pockets. These developments have created new problems, new needs, new attitudes which in turn have created new programs, laws, licenses, regulations, and controls.

As a consequence of these changes and developments, the likelihood of a citizen confrontation with some arm of the many arms of Government is infinitely greater today than it was 20 years ago. Moreover, the substance of the conflict is more complicated and, in terms of both property and personal liberty, the results of the conflict are more consequential. In such circumstances, the citizen's only protection is in stronger procedural safeguards. To quote Mr. Justice Frankfurter:

The history of liberty has largely been the history of procedural safeguards.

Under our Constitution, the people of the United States are regarded as citizens rather than subjects. As such, they are entitled to deal with the agencies of Government on a parity. The purpose of my bill is to restore a proper citizen-Government balance by insuring that agency procedures governing the settlement of disputes are not weighted against the citizen.

In pursuance of that purpose, my bill will guarantee that interested citizens who may be affected by agency rules and regulations will have an effective voice in the formulation of those rules and regulations.

These rules, including those which govern practice before the agency, and

subsequent modifications or interpretations of these rules should be fully publicized.

For the sake of the citizen, rules concerning investigations, hearings, evidence, and decisions should be clear and constant and should guarantee every element of due process.

The practice of depositions and discovery and the prehearing conference procedure which have been used so successfully in the Federal district courts to narrow the issues and expedite the trial, must be adapted to adversary proceedings before administrative and regulatory agencies so far as practicable.

The citizen should have the unrestricted right to use subpoenas and to demand declaratory orders.

In the field of administrative appeals, the citizen's rights should be broadened and a new system of interlocutory appeals should be inaugurated to reduce the number of final appeals that otherwise would have to be made to the agency level.

In the field of court appeals, the citizen should be guaranteed recourse to the Federal district courts except where there is specific statutory provision for appeal to another Federal court. Venue in such appeals should be patterned after that fixed in title 28 United States Code 1391 enacted in 1962 so that the citizen will not be required to come to Washington but rather will be allowed to file his complaint in the Federal district court where he resides or has his principal place of business, or where the agency proceeding took place, or where any real property involved in the proceeding is situated.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to commend the gentleman for his introduction of legislation to update the Administrative Procedure Act. I know of the gentleman's interest in this field. It is an interest of many years' duration. In 1962, the gentleman was the author of the venue statute to which he has just referred. He fought hard and successfully to allow citizens having causes of actions against Government agencies to sue the Government at home, in their own districts. He proposes now to extend that principle to administrative appeals.

The gentleman's observation about the increasing complexity of the Government and the decreasing status of the individual citizen in it certainly is well put and well taken.

The gentleman from Virginia is one of those individuals who does not merely decry the increasing complexity and power of government; he is a Member of Congress who proposes to do something about it.

The bill the gentleman is introducing today is evidence of the fact that the gentleman from Virginia is a "doer" rather than a talker. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. POFF. I most sincerely appreciate the generosity of the gentleman's

remarks. So long as he continues in the same vein I shall be glad to yield to him the remainder of the time which has been made available to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a broad-brush picture of the provisions and purposes of the legislation I introduced today. Similar legislation passed the other body in the last Congress. It is my hope that the House will take the lead this year and register its urgent concern for citizen protection in this vital area.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS— PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 6098

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight on Monday next to file a report and supplemental views to accompany H.R. 6098, the interest equalization tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), which I believe is for 10 minutes and which was to follow mine, precede my special order of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NONPROLIFERATION TREATY—A NUCLEAR YALTA?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOSMER), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in negotiating the nonproliferation treaty the Johnson administration trustfully looks ahead to a rosy era in which promises are kept, nuclear spread is stopped, U.S. security is enhanced and so on ad infinitum or nauseum, as the case may be. Humbug. Why the apparent Soviet shift from negative to positive on this treaty? I say "apparent" because they have wanted it all along, craftily figured the way to get it was seemingly to be forced, and are now laughing up their sleeves. The long negotiations gave them a forum to spew out venomous propaganda against the United States, West Germany, and others. It gave their atomic scientists several years to turn into lethal hardware knowledge gained before the test ban, in 1962, for 40 tests in and above the atmosphere. They multiplied their ICBM's and deployed a nuclear-tipped ABM system. The same years were those of ever intensifying U.S. involvement in Vietnam. As the administration's peace image tarnished, with wily contumacy the Soviets fanned in it an almost hysterical yen to consummate tarnish-removing treaties. The Soviets watched as they might

watch a dog drool for a bone. By a negotiating striptease—peeling off small concessions and hints—they sharpened the Johnson administration's treaty desires while they themselves moved closer to the bone. Why? What, in addition to that already related, does the view of this treaty from the Kremlin offer them that we do not see? The answer is several sided.

A prime Soviet objective since NATO was formed in the late 1940's has been to weaken it and then dispose of it and all other free world alliances. Unquestionably the course of negotiations has reinforced European misgivings over whether, when the chips are down, the United States itself will come to NATO's nuclear defense. At the same time it sees the United States gasping for a treaty which simultaneously will ban Europe from developing atomic defenses on its own and bar the United States from selling nuclear weapons to it for Europe's independent self-defense against Soviet aggression. Is this a nuclear Yalta? Actions speak louder than words and despite Johnson-Rush-McNamara reassurances Europeans increasingly weigh the advantages of turning from Washington and making their own accommodation with Moscow's desire for world dominance. The seeming "togetherness" of the United States with the U.S.S.R. on this treaty can almost, by them, be taken as precedent. Recently in London Premier Kosygin told newsmen that "whether the Federal Republic of Germany likes it or not, the document must be signed." Almost contemporaneously—to gain West German adherence—head shrinking treatments were given to Foreign Minister Willy Brandt by President Johnson in Washington and to Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger by Soviet Ambassador Semyon Tsarapkin in Bonn.

Another prime Soviet objective is to get rid of the U.S. strategic deterrent. The Soviets deployed a damage-limiting ABM system while we negotiated. This affects the credibility of our deterrent when considered in parallel with McNamara's unwillingness to go for a U.S. ABM system and his refusal to replace the aging SAC bomber fleet. Of greater significance from the Soviet viewpoint, however, is what they may consider a "technology and treaty" approach to ending the deterrent. They may believe, and induce others to believe, that the delays and limitations of underground testing, together with their extensive 1962 test effort, compared with our modest effort, have given them a substantial lead in nuclear technology. Their ABM deployment and the absence of ours could be an argument to this point. They also see, perhaps have participated in, the buildup of pressures for a treaty banning even underground tests which could allow the United States to catch up. The Johnson administration shows every willingness to negotiate it either as a condition of the nonproliferation treaty or a quick follow-on to it. If, indeed, the Soviets have gained nuclear superiority, and before admitting it can maneuver an underground ban to freeze their superiority into permanent being, the U.S. deterrent will vanish. The ball game will be over.

SPECIAL ETHICS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bush] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this special order, I would like to ask unanimous consent for all Members to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this subject for a period of 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today so that a number of our new Republican Members of the 90th Congress can address ourselves to the tremendously important subject of ethical behavior in the House of Representatives.

First, I want to make very clear that all of us support the active leadership role taken in this important area by our distinguished minority leader and by the Policy Committee. Both have made forceful appeals for a special ethics committee. I hope what we do here will enforce and back up the forthright position that they have taken on this important subject.

Today I have introduced a House resolution (H. Res. 279) creating a select ethics committee and establishing rigid requirements for disclosure of assets and liabilities; disclosure of relationships with certain businesses, firms, and lobbyists; and also establishing full disclosure of certain nepotistic relationships.

Many of my colleagues are joining today in introducing similar or identical resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves is really a very basic and simple one: Does a Congressman have the right to behave as he pleases—or does he have an obligation to the Congress and to the country to observe certain standards of conduct?

Well, the Republican answer to that is very clear. We feel we most definitely do have an obligation. Like Caesar's wife, every Member of this House must be above suspicion. And if that means a self-imposed code of conduct, so be it.

A problem exists; we must face up to it. We have a responsibility; we must live up to it.

This is not a matter of exposing our weaknesses; rather we should look on this as an opportunity to demonstrate our strengths.

James Reston wrote in the New York Times yesterday, February 26, in a column devoted to corruption in America, that—

The habit of honesty in the U.S.—in its people and in its institutions—is still too strong to be overwhelmed.

That is why it is so important that we take the initiative. We must make the moves that will lead to a practical code of conduct, because if we do not, if we keep putting it off, we shall be answerable for any misconduct to an aroused and angry America with that "habit of honesty that is too strong to be overwhelmed."

It is important that we now use our energies to find ways of preventing misconduct, not waste our energies figuring out ways to punish it. We are being watched. And if anyone doubts it, he will find out soon enough if the House tries to pretend that the issue of congressional ethics is not a matter of real concern to every American. We cannot put this matter aside again. This time we must do something. It is too late to do nothing.

My resolution calls for the creation of a special Ethics Committee. It goes further. It would make all Members disclose their principal assets and liabilities, their sources of income, their relationships with businesses which are beholden to the Federal Government for their right to do business. In addition it calls for a full disclosure of relatives on the payroll, and it requires the spelling out of any relationship financial or personal, with any lobbyist.

I know that some will feel this is an invasion of privacy or that by inference it suggests that many Members of the House have something to hide. This criticism misses the point.

No one is anxious to lay out for public scrutiny his personal financial affairs, but regrettably it must be done. For rightly or wrongly, until we act and act with force, the country is going to hold us in suspicion. I would add right here that these disclosure provisions should also apply to candidates for the Congress as well as Members. This must be covered by legislation which we should promptly enact.

Some people say, "Oh, this disclosure stuff is old hat." I say that it is not old—it has never been tried.

I have been impressed by the seriousness of purpose of the Republican leadership in this broad area. It is the purpose today of the new Members to add our voices to the battle. True, we lack experience in the House, but we bring to this problem a fresh look. We feel totally uninhibited by tradition in this one sensitive area, because we think we heard the unmistakable clear voice of the people saying on November 8, "Go there and do something to restore respect for the House."

We like the concept of a special Ethics Committee and many of us like the idea of doing more. We must demonstrate to the American people that we have nothing to hide. To so demonstrate we must bend over backward as far as our own personal disclosures go; but if these disclosures remove the doubt that is troubling many Americans about their Congress, then it will have been worthwhile.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently call on the leadership of this House to give us some action in this important area.

I know I speak for many of my colleagues when I say we do not come to this floor today leveling any charges at any Member or group. We come here having taken a fresh look at the problem; we come here feeling we do know the will of the people on this important issue; we come here with a constructive spirit and with open minds; we come here restless with the status quo and eager to try.

We come here determined to be a part of the first Congress in history that has

February 27, 1967

actually been willing to come to grips—forcefully and specifically—with this very touchy and difficult subject. This time we must do something—it is too late to do nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to yield to any of my colleagues who desire to participate in this colloquy.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for the stand which he has taken today on the commencement of this particular action. However, I would like to add these few words:

This is a statement which has been signed so far by 43 Members of the new freshman Republican group:

We newly elected Republican Congressmen feel certain that the Congress of the United States—possibly with a few rare exceptions—is composed of men and women who are honest, dedicated and prepared both to preach and to practice adherence to a code of high personal morality and conduct.

We feel strongly that no duly elected individual member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.

In an effort to cause these feelings to take solid form, a number of us have earlier in this session introduced, or are today introducing or supporting, bills and resolutions looking to these goals.

In order to demonstrate to the people of the United States in a clear and convincing manner the fact that these feelings are not ours alone but are also the feelings of the entire Congress, we urge the entire Congress, and particularly the Members thereof sitting in positions of leadership in this Congress as Members of the majority Democratic party, to insist upon immediate study of and action upon proposed changes in House Rules and in statutes that will incorporate these feelings as part of such rules and statutes. We intend to push as hard as we are able toward the earliest possible attainment of these goals.

Done this 27th day of February, 1967 in Washington, D.C. by:

SHERMAN P. LLOYD, JOHN PAUL HAMMER-SCHMIDT, GUY VANDER JACHT, CHARLES E. WIGGINS, DANIEL E. BUTTON, WILLIAM V. ROTH, WILLIAM O. COWGER, GEORGE BUSH, THOMAS S. KLEPPE, DAN KUYKENDALL, JAMES C. GARDNER.

MARGARET M. HECKLER, DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., CLARENCE E. MILLER, HENRY C. SCHADEBERG, JOHN M. ZWACH, LOUIS C. WYMAN, M. G. SNYDER, HOWARD W. POLLOCK, SAM STEIGER, WILLIAM C. WAMPLER, CHARLES W. SANDMAN.

JOHN DELLENBACK, GARRY BROWN, J. HERBERT BURKE, THOMAS J. MESKILL, CHALMERS P. WYLIE, WILEY MAYNE, CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR., WILLIAM A. STEIGER, FLETCHER THOMPSON, JOHN E. HUNT, GILBERT GUDE.

LARRY WINN, JR., ROGER H. ZEON, EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, JAMES A. MCCLURE, JAMES V. SMITH, EDWARD G. BIESTER, DONALD E. LUKENS, ROBERT D. PRICE, WILLIAM L. SCOTT, ROBERT V. DENNEY, PHILIP E. RUPPE, TOM RAILSBACK.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oregon and I commend the gentleman for his forthright approach to this subject.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as distasteful as it may be, it is an irrefutable fact of life that the elected official is regarded by those who elect him as capable of the most flagrant dishonor. Having most recently joined the ranks of this distinguished body, we of the freshman class are possibly even more cognizant of this fact than our more senior colleagues. It is my intention, and I am certain the will of my fellow freshmen, that the code of ethics herein proposed makes it patently clear that defections of honor are totally rejected as a way of congressional life. I urge the adoption of this code, as well as an Election Reform Act which I am today introducing, not as an admission that wholesale chicanery will run rampant without it, but that our behavior will not be modified by its implementation. That the practices spelled out in the code are in keeping with our present conduct.

There will always be those among us, on both sides of the aisle, who will succumb to avarice; the code will not prevent this. The code will make the apprehension of the guilty more accessible; it will, most important of all, make the innocence of the vast majority of the membership of this body abundantly discernible.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise to commend the gentleman from Texas on his presentation of this much-discussed subject. At this point in the proceedings, I want to go on record as being in favor of part I, which covers the establishment of a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This is in accordance with the Republican policy committee recommendation, and I agree with it. We presently have a code of ethics in the House which was passed on July 11, 1958, and which sets forth 10 points to which any person in Government service should adhere. I would suggest to the select committee so recommended by this resolution to carefully review these 10 points and to consider proper ways and means of enforcing them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these 10 points at this point in the Record. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

The 10 points referred to are as follows:

I. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

II. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and legal regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

III. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving to the performance of his duties his earnest effort and best thought.

IV. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks accomplished.

V. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or his family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of his governmental duties.

VI. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

VII. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties.

VIII. Never use any information coming to him confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means for making private profit.

IX. Expose corruption wherever discovered.

X. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

Mr. BUSH. I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Texas in urging support for the ethics and disclosure bill and to reiterate its importance to the House and to the Nation. We are all cognizant of the fact that each and every Member of Congress is presently governed by a written code of ethics which was adopted on July 11, 1958. Although I sincerely feel that even this code is really unnecessary to establish a standard of conduct for the vast majority of our Members, I am proud that we have one. At any rate, under the existing code of conduct, the Members of Congress are governed mostly by their own conscience since there is no permanent organization or structure to investigate complaints or recommend disciplinary action by the Congress.

Instances where it was necessary for congressional action to discipline a Member for unethical conduct have indeed been rare. Yet we know that these possibilities are real and I can think of no better way to provide for these possibilities than the ethics and disclosure bill which establishes a Select Committee of the House on Standards and Conduct. This committee will operate strictly on a nonpartisan basis and its work will be geared to enhance and strengthen the standards of conduct of the Members of the House.

We all know that the general public's opinion of the ethics of Members of Congress is not too high compared to the other professions, and their opinion is particularly low right now. This resolution is an excellent opportunity for us to demonstrate and proclaim to the public that we are opposed to unethical practices in any shape or form, and we are prepared to do something to guard against violations of our standards of

conduct by establishing a committee for this purpose. We should be willing to judge our own Members and ready and able to deal with violations of our code with measures as harsh as necessary. The other provisions of the resolution providing for full disclosure strengthen our position that we are operating above board with nothing to hide and this is the way it should be.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for those pertinent comments.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL].

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been a Member of this House for so short a time, I would ordinarily be reticent about urging reforms in the procedures of the House. The rules, traditions, and operations of the House have been evolved over the years. Generations of able minds have developed them in response to particular situations and in the quest for orderly, truly representative government. One does not lightly propose changes in a system which has brought just government to more free citizens than any other in history.

But what is proposed today by my colleagues and myself also follows years of tradition—bad tradition. From the beginning, scandals involving various Members of Congress have marred the public image of the legislative branch. Their cumulative effect has been to undermine public trust in our democratic institutions. Recent allegations of misdeeds by Members and employees have shocked the Nation. Three of the major cases are very much with us today. One of them, arising in this body, is moving to a partial solution, at least, by the House on Wednesday. Another, involving an employee of the other body, has resulted in court convictions which are now on appeal. The third involves a Member of the other body from my own State.

In addition, we can read almost daily in the press vague references to other misdeeds. The public demands and is entitled to reform. My bill, House Resolution 166, and the others of my colleagues, are designed to provide not only a strict, fair code of ethics for the Congress but also the machinery for enforcing it. Until this is done, a cloud of moral suspicion will continue to hang corrosively over this Capitol. Let us act now to drive it away.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for his comments.

I would like to add, though, that I am sure all of us as new Members feel the concern that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MESKILL] expressed in his opening comments, but I would also add that perhaps we can take a new and fresh look at this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his forthright statement.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER].

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on the day Congress convened in January, my first day as a Member of the National House, I favored adoption of a code of ethics for Members of Congress. I believed strongly then, and believe strongly now, that such a code should be adopted.

A law setting forth a code of ethics has been enacted for members of the Massachusetts Legislature and are laws in the books in other States. In my judgment, there certainly should be an effective code of ethics for Members of Congress, the highest lawmaking body in the Nation. Congress not only should do this but we have a duty and responsibility to do it.

The fortune—or misfortune—of one Member of Congress is but a shadow of the problem. Its substance, and the larger issue, is the conduct—or misconduct—of Congress itself.

A resolution of the hard problem posed by the gentleman from New York will be worse than meaningless if it is not accompanied by reforms of wider application.

To seat, to censure, and to fine a duly elected Representative for abuse of his public trust without imposing equal demands and expectations on his colleagues, would lend credence to the charge of hypocrisy which the censured Member has already flung at these Chambers.

How can the House content itself with chastising one Member for violation of an ethical code yet to be explicitly defined for all Members?

How can the House, in conscience, settle the accounts of one Member without settling the accountability of all Members?

How can the House slap one Member's wrist without holding out all Members' hands for inspection?

If the Congress does not ask itself these questions, the people will ask them.

Only the rapid development of a congressional code of ethics and its continuing enforcement by a standing committee from both Houses, will deny the gentleman from New York the martyr's robes. And, more importantly, only such a code and such a committee will insure the continued confidence in the Congress of our citizenry.

The country waits for Congress. Let us not keep them waiting.

For these reasons I maintain that the Congress must enact a strict, effective, and fair code of ethics now.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and certain material in tabular form.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH], in introducing and discussing a subject that deeply concerns the people of this country and this Congress—ethics and standards.

We discuss today the ethics in this

and the other Chamber and in our election process. This is a subject that deserves more discussion and attention. It is a subject that we must concern ourselves with if we are to continue to have a workable relationship as Members of Congress with those who have elected us.

The strength of our Government, of our federal system as we know it today, depends on the strength of our American system of elections as well as the faith the governed hold in those who govern. Our activity, in the past, in the future and now, will dictate our constituents' faith in our ability to serve.

It is primarily, Mr. Speaker, through the exercise of the franchise to vote that American citizens participate in self-government. It is, therefore, vitally important that we, as their duly elected representatives in this Congress, keep our constituents informed of our actions and purposes and that we leave no doubt in their minds as to the purpose of any actions.

I have joined today with a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to establish the procedure for Members of Congress, their spouses, and their assistants to disclose publicly their income and financial assets and liabilities. Both the resolution and the bill I have introduced will accomplish this important task. In keeping with the intent of this legislation, I have today placed on public file with the Clerk of the House a statement of my financial holdings.

The bill establishing the Election Reform Act of 1967 which I have introduced today will also take an important step toward filling another glaring weakness in our present system. The Election Reform Act of 1967 will close the holes in our present law, the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925. It will make sweeping changes in the reporting by candidates of expenditures for their campaign and the contributions they receive. In effect, it will create a reporting system where now we have none.

Mr. Speaker, the American Legion magazine, in August of 1966, did an excellent job of outlining some of the problems now in existence with regard to the Corrupt Practices Act. The magazine said in part:

The costs of campaigning in the United States have skyrocketed in recent years, and no end is in sight. In 1912, the Democrats reported spending \$1,134,848 to elect Woodrow Wilson President, but in 1964 it cost the Republicans 17 times as much—\$19,314,796—to run Barry Goldwater's unsuccessful campaign for the Presidency. In 1948, the total reported national-level expenditures of the political parties was \$8,771,879. In 1964, the total had soared to \$47,762,890.

It's been estimated that the real, total national bill for political campaigns in 1964, from the Presidency down to town government, was in the neighborhood of \$200 million—up from \$140 million in 1952. In 1962, when the Presidency wasn't even at stake, about \$100 million—or about \$2 for each of the 53 million Americans who went to the polls—was spent on races for Congress, state and local government.

Mr. Speaker, it has become the procedure, unhappily, for both political parties to raise the substantial amounts needed for political campaigns from

large contributors. My bill is designed to severely restrict this practice and encourage small contributions of up to \$100.

A November 18, 1966, editorial of the Sheboygan Press in Sheboygan, Wis., provides a good discussion of the difficult situation surrounding the soaring cost of political activities. I include that editorial at this point as part of my remarks:

POLITICAL EXPENSES

Three members of the Senate bowed out when the 89th Congress adjourned. Senators Neuberger of Oregon, Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Simpson of Wyoming were not seeking re-election.

Saltonstall and Simpson may deliver themselves of some reflections, in due course, on their experiences in Washington. Mrs. Neuberger already has uttered some sharp words that merits some attention. She went out with a penetrating and disturbing comments on her impressions of being a senator, specifically on the expense of maintaining membership in that august body.

"Everything comes back to money," she said. "It's the one with the most money who will win. It is a thwarting of what we call the great democracy." It seems so, indeed, when measured against what is spent on many a Senate election. She said her 1960 campaign cost \$80,000 and termed it "cheap" compared to the \$2 million required in an Illinois senatorial election. Expenses in the larger states of New York and California reportedly are even higher.

These observations by a retiring Senator are rather thought provoking. Mrs. Neuberger stands little to gain by making them, and perhaps could generate a touch of enmity with her former colleagues. The Congress in its recent session passed an imperfect bill granting the principal political parties certain funds contributed by willing taxpayers. The Neuberger remarks indicate that once a workable formula is achieved for presidential elections, as the new legislation provides, efforts should be made to extend the system to lesser offices.

In order to help overcome part of this problem, Mr. Speaker, the last Congress passed a \$1-per-person tax checkoff plan. I think the law is a poor one and include as part of my remarks two excellent editorials from newspapers in the Sixth District of Wisconsin, regarding this matter:

[From the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter]

DANGERS ARE APPARENT

Last year the Congress passed a \$1-per-person tax checkoff plan for presidential campaign contributions. The foolish decision of Congress represents an extremely dangerous grant of power the heads of the national political parties.

It is estimated that each party will receive approximately \$30 million.

Offhand—it is possible to ask why the Internal Revenue Service should serve as a collection agency for partisan politics.

President Johnson signed the "Christmas Tree" bill with a statement saying "presidential candidates will no longer have to rely on special interest groups to meet the heavy financial burden of a campaign." Most everyone still has Bobby Baker in mind.

It is difficult to understand why partisan presidential campaigns should be sponsored by the public. There is nothing wrong if an individual wants to send a dollar to the Democrats or the Republicans, but it certainly should not be deducted from his income tax payments, and, the overburdened Internal Revenue Service should not be saddled with the task of making the deductions.

The trouble with the whole idea is that it places too much money without any restraints in the hands of political organizations.

Robert F. Kennedy, New York Democratic Senator, sort of hit the proverbial nail on the head when he said:

"Say you were my friend here in the City of New York and I was head of the Democratic Party. I'd say to you, Here's \$500,000. I hope you can work for the candidate in 1968. . . . And if you have a struggle for the nomination you know that the money is going to go to the national committee. . . . He can easily indicate to various parts of the country that they will receive large amounts of money if they vote in a way that meets his wishes."

There is extremely serious danger when Congress attempts to intertwine tax collections and methods with partisan and sometimes corrupt politics.

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent]

HOW NOT TO FINANCE CAMPAIGNS

There has been a growing concern among many politicians and thoughtful voters that the ever-rising costs of campaigning make political office unattainable for some and unpalatable for others. But one way not to remedy the situation is the tax credit amendment hurriedly tacked on to the tax bill passed by the United States Senate in its closing moments Saturday.

The provision, put into the bill by Senator Long, aims at helping to finance presidential campaigns. A box on individual income tax returns may be checked by taxpayers beginning in 1968 if they wish to contribute \$1 to a presidential campaign fund and have \$1 deducted from their tax. Couples filing joint returns may contribute and deduct \$2. The major political parties, every four years, would then split the money subject to limitations on the number of votes cast in the preceding presidential election. A minor party could get a share only by polling five million votes in the preceding election. According to the formula, the Democratic and Republican parties would each get \$35 million for 1968.

The overwhelming victories of Democratic candidates have alarmed even some non-Republicans that our two party system itself is in peril. The tax credit would aim somewhat at reducing this danger. As far as a valid deductible expense for every taxpayer interested in maintaining the two-party system, the credit is probably sound.

But it overlooks every taxpayer's right to support the party of his choice. In order to get a tax credit—and a very minor one—he must financially support both parties. And somehow it does not seem likely that either presidential candidate of the two major parties is in such dire need. The money is needed far more down the line where neither \$1,000 President's Clubs nor massive union and fat cat support generally lie. And while there is always some danger of too much power in elections being in the hands of minor parties such as may be once more happening in the New York gubernatorial race this fall, a tax credit going only to the major parties in the form of a \$35 million windfall puts an added handicap upon the development of a third party when it may some day be advantageous for our political system. There is certainly the possibility, as Senator Gore insisted, that such a provision is not giving equal protection of the laws.

If there is merit in the idea that political contributions should be tax deductible, a much better way would be to permit each taxpayer to deduct his contributions up to a certain amount regardless of party or candidate.

Mr. Speaker, in order for us to more thoroughly understand the problem that

exists insofar as our present election laws are concerned, I would like to include at this point the history of the development of the Federal election laws as outlined on pages 3, 4, and 5 of the "Regulation of Political Finance," published in 1966 by the Institute of Governmental Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Citizen's Research Foundation at Princeton, N.J.:

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Federal legislation relating to money in politics first took the form of protection against political assessment of federal employees in 1867. This provision was later extended and broadened in the Civil Service Reform Act of 1883 which forbade the solicitation of campaign funds from any federal officer or employee by a fellow officer or employee, or by any other persons on federal premises. A 1907 law prohibited political contributions by national banks and corporations in election of federal officials. A 1910 Act of Congress, providing for publicity of election campaign receipts and expenditures, was amended in 1911 to require similar pre-election statements and to limit the amounts that could be spent by candidates for the House and Senate. These provisions extended to primary elections and conventions, but provision for this coverage was struck down by the Supreme Court in the Newberry decision in 1921. Subsequent court cases, mainly U.S. vs. Classic, would permit such coverage today, yet Congress has not fully reasserted its power over the nominating phase of the electoral process, and publicity provisions still reflect the Newberry decision.

Relevant federal legislation was codified and revised but not substantially changed, in the Federal Corrupt Practices Act of 1925, which still remains the basic law although amendments were made to some of its provision in 1944, 1947, and 1948. This act regulates the reporting of receipts and expenditures of political committees that are active in two or more states.

The Hatch Act, enacted in 1939 and amended in 1940, established a \$5,000 limitation, backed by criminal sanctions, on the size of individual contributions made during a calendar year in connection with a campaign for federal office; the act also put a \$3,000,000 limitation on the amount that can be spent by an interstate political committee, to influence or attempt to influence the election of a candidate for federal office.

The prohibition against corporate contributions has been complemented by similar ones against contributions by labor unions in both the Smith-Connally Act of 1944 and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Thus it is unlawful either for unions or corporations to make direct contributions or expenditures in any federal election, primary election, political convention, or caucus.

State legislation has followed much the same pattern as the federal. The financial activities of candidates for the United States Senate and House are regulated concurrently by the federal and state governments, or by the states alone; campaign finance for all state and local candidates, parties, and committees is regulated by the states alone. Only certain committees operating in two or more states or for the election of federal officers are beyond the control of the states.

With this background, we should review the procedures of the State governments and compare that with present procedures at the Federal level.

Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 found on pages 59 through 67 of the "Regulation of Political Finance" provide this information and I would like to include those tables as part of my remarks at this point:

February 27, 1967

TABLE 1.—Contribution and expenditure statements

[Key: Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s); R—Receipts; D—Disbursements; P—Primary election; G—General election]

State	Statements required from	Statements must contain	Forms provided by State or prescribed by statute	Campaign affected	Time of filing	Failure to file reported to prosecutor	Statement inspected by official	Excessive or illegal expenditures reported to prosecutor
Alaska	Cand. ¹	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after P; 30 days after G.			
Alabama								
Arizona	Cand., com. & others ²	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 30 days after G.			
Arkansas	Cand.	D.	Yes	P.	30 days after.			
California	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	35 days after each.			
Colorado	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	(9)	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Connecticut	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each.			
Delaware						Yes	Yes	Yes.
Florida	Cand. com. & depositories ⁴	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(9)			
Georgia								
Hawaii	Cand., agents & com.	D.		P. & G.	20 days after each.			
Idaho	Cand.	R. & D.		P.	20 days after.			
Illinois						Yes		
Indiana	Cand., agents & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	(7)			
Iowa	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each ⁸			
Kansas	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³		P. & G.	(9)			
Kentucky	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days before each; 30 days after each.			
Louisiana								
Maine	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 15 days before G; 30 days after P. & G.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Maryland	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	20 days after each.	Yes	Yes	
Massachusetts	Cand., treas. of com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	14 days after P; between 3d & 2nd Tues. before G; & 14 days after G.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Michigan	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days after P; 20 days after each.	Yes		
Minnesota	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	8 days before each; 10 days after each.			
Mississippi	Cand.	R. & D.	Yes	P.	(10)	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Missouri	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³		P. & G.	30 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Montana	Cand., com. & others.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	Cand.; 15 days after each; com. & others—10 days after each.	Yes	Yes	
Nebraska	Cand. & com.	R. & D. ³	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹¹			
Nevada						Yes	Yes	Yes.
New Hampshire	Cand., com. & others ¹²	R. & D.		P. & G.	Before & after ¹³			
New Jersey	Cand., com. & depositories	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹⁴			
New Mexico	Cand., & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ¹⁵	Yes ¹⁶	Yes	Yes.
New York	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before each; 20 days after each.	Yes		
North Carolina	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	10 days before; 20 days after ¹⁷			
North Dakota	Cand.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Ohio	Cand., com. & others	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	45 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Oklahoma	Cand., com. & others.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Cands. 10 days after P only; coms. 10 days after all elections.			
Oregon	Cand., com. & others ¹⁸	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	15 days after each.	Yes	Yes ¹⁹	Yes.
Pennsylvania	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	30 days after each.			
Rhode Island								
South Carolina	Cand.	D.		P. & G.	Before and after each.		Yes	Yes.
South Dakota	Cand., com. & others ²⁰	R. & D. ³		P. & G.	30 days after each.			
Tennessee	Cand. & campaign mgr.	D.		P. & G.	5 10 days before, cand.; 30 days after, campaign mgr. (or cand. if no mgr.) ²¹	Yes ²²		
Texas	Cand. & others ²³	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-10 days before each; & 10 days after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Utah	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Before & after ²⁴			
Vermont	Cand.	D.		P.	10 days after.			
Virginia	Cand.	D.		P. & G.	30 days after each.			
Washington	Cand.	D.		P.	10 days after.	Yes		
West Virginia	Cand. & com.	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	7-15 days before each; 30 days after each.			
Wisconsin	Cand., com. & others ²⁵	R. & D.	Yes	P. & G.	Tuesday before & Tuesday after each.	Yes	Yes	Yes.
Wyoming	Cand., com. & others.	R. & D. ²⁶		P. & G.	20 days after each.			
United States	Cand., com. & others ²⁷	R. & D.		G.	(27)			

¹ Candidate must file affidavit supporting committee statement.² Statements required from each campaign committee which manages a candidate's campaign before a primary election, or manages the campaign for a political party, and every person who engages in political propaganda, and collects or expends any money or valuable thing in connection therewith.³ Committee statements include receipts and disbursements; candidate statements include only disbursements.⁴ Candidates must file statements within 10 days after primary and 30 days after general election. Committees must file within 30 days after general election only.⁵ Candidate must designate campaign treasurer and bank depository. Statements required from banks acting as campaign fund depositories, as well as from candidates and committees.⁶ Candidates and committees submit statements as follows:^a In the case of candidates for Governor and U.S. Senator: Before the election—on the Monday of each week during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.^b All other offices: Before the election—on the first Monday of each month during the campaign. After the election—15 days after the election.^c Depositories to file statements within 15 days after the election.⁷ Candidates must file report of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after primary or general election. The treasurer of a political committee or a political agent must file a report within 20 days.⁸ Candidates must file after both primary and general elections. Political party central committees must file only after general elections.⁹ Candidates must file statements within 30 days after both primary and general elections. Annual statements to be filed on December 31 are required of all political committees and other organizations engaged in promoting the success or defeat of candidates; parties, or constitutional amendments.¹⁰ Contribution statements required 1st and 15th day of each month of the primary campaign and the last Saturday before the primary. Expenditure statements required 30 days after the primary.¹¹ Candidates to file only statements of disbursements within 10 days after each election. Committees, however, must file statements of contributions 15 days before each election, listing the names of persons contributing more than \$25. In addition, each day that an individual contribution exceeding \$25 is made, the committee must file a statement of it. Committee statements of contributions and disbursements must be made within 20 days after each election. A further requirement that individuals contributing more than \$250 to any campaign fund should themselves submit statements was repealed in 1953.¹² Statements required from candidates, fiscal agents designated by the nominators of candidates in presidential preference primary, and state and other political committees.¹³ Statements to be filed as follows:^a The state committee of every political party shall file, not later than the Wednesday preceding the election, with the Secretary of State, an itemized statement, signed and sworn to by its chairman and treasurer. A second statement must be similarly filed not later than the second Friday after the election. Enough additional copies of the statement shall be filed to provide a copy for the state committee of every party on the ballot; the Secretary of State furnishes these to the committees upon request.^b Major candidates and the fiscal agent designated by the nominators of any candidate in the presidential preference primary shall similarly file sworn statements. However, the candidate need not report expenditures by the political committee of his party in elections other than primaries. Other candidates need file only by the second Friday after the election.^c Other political committees shall similarly file sworn statements before and after the election.¹⁴ Candidates and committees must report receipts and disbursements on the Friday or Saturday before an election and disbursements only within 20 days after an election. Bank depositories of campaign funds must report receipts and disbursements 20 days after an election.¹⁵ Candidate must file a statement of expenditures 10 days after the primary and general elections. The committees must file statements of receipts and expenditures within 30 days after each election.¹⁶ Appropriate court may require filing upon complaint of any candidate or 5 qualified voters.¹⁷ Candidates file statements before and after primaries only. Political committees file statements before and after primaries and general elections.¹⁸ Persons expending or contributing more than \$50 must file statement within 10 days after election.¹⁹ Five voters may petition appropriate court for audit of expenditures.²⁰ Any person not a member of such committee who collects or disburses over \$5 must file a statement.²¹ Any person making one or more contributions or loans aggregating more than \$100 to a candidate must report these contributions if the candidate does not report them.²² Voters can institute *quo warranto* proceedings.

Footnotes continued on following page.

²³ Candidates personal committees and state committees must file statements on the second Saturday after such candidate or committee has first made a disbursement or incurred any obligation, and thereafter on the second Saturday of each month until all disbursements have been accounted for. They shall also file a final statement on the Saturday preceding the election to contain all transactions not theretofore accounted for. All other political committees must file statements 30 days after any election.

²⁴ Any corporation, association, organization, committee, club or group, which advocates, endorses, or opposes any political party, faction or group or any candidate for office, or any constitutional amendment or measures to be voted on by people must file statements.

²⁵ Candidates must file statements of expenditures; committees must file statements

of both receipts and expenditures. Any other person receiving or expending \$50 on behalf of the campaign must also file statement.

²⁶ Statements required from others who spend more than \$50 per annum for purposes of influencing in 2 or more states the election of candidates.

²⁷ Candidates must file statements 10 to 15 days before and 30 days after a general election. Committees must file statements on Jan. 1, the 1st and 10th of March, June and September; and between the 10th and 15th day and on the 5th day preceding the date of the general election.

²⁸ Requirements for candidates and managers apply to both primary and general elections. In the primary elections statements are filed with the chairman of the executive committee of the party, and in the general elections statements are filed with the Secretary of State.

TABLE 2.—Campaign expenditure limitations and enumeration requirements

[Key: AS—Annual salary; P—Primary election; G—General election; Cand.—Candidate(s); Com.—Committee(s)]

State	Governor	U.S. Senator	U.S. Representative	Campaign affected	Limit applies to expenditures by—	Certain expenditures exempted from limitations	Legitimate expenses enumerated
Alabama	\$50,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	P and G combined	Cand. only	Yes	Yes.
Alaska							
Arizona	\$2,500	\$3,500	\$2,500	P	Cand., agent, and coms.	Yes	
Arkansas	\$5,000	100 percent AS ²	100 percent AS ²	(2)	Cand. only		
California							Yes.
Colorado							
Connecticut	(4)	(No limits imposed by new election laws of 1963.)	(4)	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁴	Yes	Yes.
Delaware		1/2 AS ²					
Florida				P and G separate ⁵			Yes.
Georgia							
Hawaii							
Idaho	\$2,000	\$5,000	\$2,500	P	Cand. only ⁷		Yes.
Illinois							Yes.
Indiana	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$10,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand. and agents ⁷	Yes	Yes.
Iowa	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. only ⁷		
Kansas	10 percent AS ²	10 percent AS ²	10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. only ⁷		
Kentucky	\$10,000			P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶		Yes.
Louisiana							
Maine							
Maryland	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand., agent, treasurer	Yes	Yes.
Massachusetts	(Limits repealed by amendments in St. 1962, c. 444, sec. 2.)						
Michigan	(4)	(4)	(4)	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶		Yes.
Minnesota	(4)			P and G combined ¹	Cand. and com.	Yes	Yes.
Mississippi	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$3,500	1st and 2d P separate ⁵	Cand. only ⁷	Yes	
Missouri	(1)	(1)	(1)	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. and com.	Yes	
Montana	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	Yes.
Nebraska							
Nevada							
New Hampshire	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$12,500	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	Yes.
New Jersey	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$15,000	P and G separate ⁵	Cand., com., and others.	Yes	Yes.
New Mexico	P: \$2,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P: \$3,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P: \$2,500 G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ¹²	Yes	Yes.
New York	\$20,000	\$12,000	\$8,000	P and G combined ¹	Cand., com., and others.		Yes.
North Carolina							
North Dakota	15 percent AS ²	15 percent AS ²	15 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	Yes.
Ohio	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$5,000 ¹³	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. only ⁷	Yes	Yes.
Oklahoma	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$25,000	P	Cand. ⁶		Yes.
Oregon	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P: 15 percent AS ² G: 10 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island							Yes.
South Carolina							
South Dakota	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G combined ¹	Cand. ¹⁴	Yes	Yes.
Tennessee	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$12,500	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ¹⁵		Yes.
Texas				P and G	Cand. and com.		Yes.
Utah	(Limitations repealed by Laws 1961, ch. 42, sec. 1.)						Yes.
Vermont	\$7,500			P	Cand. ³		Yes.
Virginia	(14)	(14)	(14)	P	Cand. ³	Yes	Yes.
Washington							
West Virginia	(\$75 for each county in State or district).						Yes.
Wisconsin	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$2,500	P and G combined ¹	Cand. ⁵	Yes	Yes.
Wyoming	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	50 percent AS ²	P and G separate ⁵	Cand. ⁶	Yes	Yes.
United States		(15)	(15)	G	Cand. and coms. ¹⁶	Yes	Yes.

¹ P and G combined: Combined aggregate total of expenditures in both primary and general election cannot exceed the limitation.

² AS: Limitation based on the annual salary of the office sought.

³ The \$5,000 limitation on expenditures by gubernatorial candidates applies to primary campaigns only. The annual salary limitation on congressional candidates includes the aggregate of all expenses in both the primary and general election campaigns. The amount may not exceed in:

a. Primary campaigns—\$10 for each 1,000 voters, or major portion thereof, who voted at the last preceding election for the candidate of the same political party and same office as the candidate who seeks nomination;

b. General election campaigns—\$15 for each 1,000 electors, or major portion thereof, qualified to vote for office in question at last preceding election.

⁴ P and G separate: Expenditures up to the limit may be made in both the primary and general election campaigns respectively.

⁵ Limit applies to expenditures by and on behalf of the candidate with his knowledge and consent.

⁶ Limitation applies to the total of all expenditures by the candidate and his agents. Candidates personally may expend additional amounts for letters, postage, printing, advertising, etc.

⁷ Limit is \$40 for each 1,000 votes cast for Governor in last preceding presidential year in State or political subdivision in which candidate is running; but no candidate shall be restricted to less than 25 percent of 1 year's compensation or \$100.

⁸ Limit is \$7,000 plus 5 cents for each of the total number of persons voting in State at last general election.

⁹ Contributions by corporations to candidates for certain high judicial offices prohibited.

¹⁰ Limit is \$8 for each 100 votes cast for all candidates for president in the State, county, district, or municipality, at the last preceding presidential election.

¹¹ State law prohibits expenditures of any money by a political party on behalf of a primary candidate.

¹² A candidate for office of Representative in Congress is limited to 3 cents for each voter in his district voting for a candidate for presidential elector at the last preceding presidential election or \$4,000, whichever is greater.

¹³ Limit is 50 cents for every vote cast for the candidate of his party receiving the largest vote at the last preceding gubernatorial election.

¹⁴ Unless the laws of the State prescribe a lesser amount, a candidate may expend up to:

a. \$10,000 if a candidate for Senator, or \$2,500 if a candidate for Representative; b. An amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 3 cents by the total number of votes cast at the last general election for all candidates for the office which the candidate seeks, but in no event exceeding \$25,000 if a candidate for Senator or \$5,000 if a candidate for Representative.

¹⁵ Political committees each limited to \$3,000 per annum.

TABLE 3.—*Regulation of campaign contributions*

State	Corporate contributions prohibited	Labor union contributions prohibited	Individual contributions limited to—	Solicitation from State employees prohibited ¹	Solicitation from candidates illegal	Contributions under fictitious names illegal
Alabama	Yes			Yes	Yes	
Alaska						
Arizona	Yes			(2)		
Arkansas				Yes		
California						
Colorado	Yes				Yes	Yes
Connecticut						
Delaware	Yes ³		\$1,000 ⁴		Yes	
Florida	Yes					
Georgia	Yes					
Hawaii	Yes					
Idaho						
Illinois				(4)		
Indiana	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Iowa	Yes			Yes		
Kansas	Yes ⁵					
Kentucky	Yes			Yes		
Louisiana	Yes			Yes		
Maine						Yes
Maryland			\$2,500			Yes
Massachusetts	Yes		(6)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan	Yes				Yes	Yes
Minnesota	Yes				Yes	
Mississippi					Yes	
Missouri	Yes				Yes	
Montana	Yes		Yes ⁷	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nebraska	Yes		\$1,000 ⁸			
Nevada						
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	\$5,000	(9)	Yes	
New Jersey	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes
New Mexico						
New York	Yes			Yes	Yes	
North Carolina	Yes					
North Dakota	Yes					Yes
Ohio	Yes			Yes ¹⁰	Yes	
Oklahoma	Yes					
Oregon	Yes ¹¹			Yes	Yes	Yes
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes		(12)		Yes
Rhode Island						
South Carolina						
South Dakota	Yes					
Tennessee	Yes					
Texas	Yes	Yes		Yes		
Utah	Yes				Yes	
Vermont						
Virginia						
Washington						
West Virginia	Yes		\$5,000	Yes	Yes	
Wisconsin	Yes			Yes		
Wyoming	Yes			Yes		
United States	Yes	Yes	\$5,000 ¹³	Yes ¹⁴		

¹ Generally refers to employees under a civil service or merit system.² It is unlawful for any person whomsoever to assess any State employee for any political purpose whatever, or to coerce by threats or otherwise any such employee into making a subscription or contribution for any such purpose.³ The following persons also are prohibited from making campaign contributions directly or indirectly: (a) holders of horse or dog racing permits; (b) holders of licenses for the sale of intoxicating beverages; and (c) operators of public utilities, except non-profit cooperatives.⁴ State employees whose tenure is subject to merit principles are forbidden to engage in certain specified prohibited political activities during working hours, and the prohibited activities include soliciting money for political purposes and making contributions of money in behalf of candidates or in support of public or political issues. The prohibition does not apply to soliciting and making contributions after working hours.⁵ Contributions by such corporations as banks, trusts, railroads, and utilities are forbidden.⁶ Individual contributions during year are limited to \$3,000 to 1 candidate, \$3,000 to 1 party, and \$3,000 to non-elected political committees not organized on behalf of any candidate.⁷ Any person expending more than \$50 in a campaign must file an itemized statement and give a duplicate to the candidate or treasurer of the political organization whose success or defeat he has sought to promote.⁸ No treasurer of a political committee shall receive or accept more than \$1,000 from any 1 person to be spent in any one campaign.⁹ Employees under civil service are not allowed to contribute money for the promotion of candidates or political issues.¹⁰ Solicitation from civil servants prohibited and receipt of contributions from mine inspectors prohibited.¹¹ Contributions prohibited from banks, utility corporations, or a majority of their stockholders.¹² Contributions may not be solicited from civil service employees and those employed by the commission and the board of parole.¹³ \$5,000 limitation applies only to contributions to a national committee during any calendar year, or in connection with any campaign for an elective Federal office. Hatch Act specifically excludes contributions to State or local committees from this limitation.¹⁴ Applies to Federal employees or to persons receiving salary or compensation for services from money derived from the U.S. Treasury.TABLE 4.—*Penalties and provisions for enforcement*

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Alabama	Misdemeanor; fine from \$100 to \$500.	Misdemeanor; fined up to \$500 and may be jailed or sentenced to hard labor up to 6 months. Candidate disqualified from office.	
Alaska			
Arizona	After primary—no certificate of nomination; unsuccessful candidate or other persons guilty of misdemeanor fined \$25 to \$500. After general election—guilty of misdemeanor.	Fine of \$100 to \$2,000 and jail 6 months to 2 years. Barred from holding office in the State.	
Arkansas	For most candidates, fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year; ineligible to hold office. U.S. Congressmen and U.S. Senators—fine \$50 to \$1,000.	Forfeit nomination for any office. Misdemeanor; fine \$500 to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	
California	Misdemeanor; no certificate of nomination or election to be issued.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	
Colorado	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file. (For illegal expenditures such as bribery.)	
Connecticut	Fine \$25 per day while in default.	Fined up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Any person may file affidavit with district attorney or State attorney general stating name of person who has violated any provisions of act and stating facts which constitute alleged offense. District attorney or State attorney general shall then prosecute. Prosecuting officer shall be notified and shall proceed to prosecute.
Delaware			
Florida	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 or jail up to 6 months. Knowing violation voids nomination or election.	Same as for failure to file.	Electors may file petition with circuit court; attorney general must act as counsel for State.

TABLE 4.—Penalties and provisions for enforcement—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
Georgia	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$500 and/or jail 6 months.	Fine \$100 to \$1,000 and/or 2 years jail or hard labor. Must vacate office. Disqualified from voting and from being elected to, holding or occupying any office, elective or appointive.	
Hawaii	Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 and/or 1 to 6 months jail. Ineligible to run for office; no name on ballot.	Disqualified from nomination or office; misdemeanor; jail up to 6 months and/or fine \$300. ¹	
Idaho	Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 and/or 1 to 6 months jail. Ineligible to run for office; no name on ballot.	Ineligible for public office for 4 years. Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action. Defeated candidate or any 10 electors may petition to prevent a candidate alleged to have violated Corrupt Practices Act from taking office.
Illinois	Can't get commission or certificate of election, or take office until statement filed. Misdemeanor; fine \$1 to \$500. Jail 30 days to 1 year, or both, and disenfranchised up to 5 years.	Misdemeanor; same as for failure to file.	Officials in place where crime was committed shall prosecute.
Indiana	Misdemeanor; jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to \$500.	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000. Candidate must vacate office; disqualified from holding public office for 2 years.	Candidate receiving certain percentage of votes may contest election. Grand jury may investigate alleged violations.
Iowa	Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000.	Fine \$100 to \$1,000. Nomination or election voided.	
Kansas	No name on ballot; no certification of nomination or election. Candidates fined not more than \$500. If committees or managers fail to file, fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 month to 1 year.		
Kentucky	Daily assessment of fine. If assessment not paid, person becomes disqualified and his name may not appear on official ballot used for any election during same calendar year.		Campaign statements reviewed by campaign reports committee composed of 2 members from the senate and 3 from the house of representatives of State legislature. Attorney general acts as committee counsel and must prosecute offenders.
Louisiana	Can't be considered elected, assume duties, or receive salary until report is filed; fine of \$1,000 and/or 1 year imprisonment.	Fine of \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for 1 year, and for some illegal expenditures shall be ineligible for any public office or for any public employment for period of 4 years from and after time of commission of such offense.	Within 30 days after election, citizens may petition court that successful candidate was guilty of corrupt practices. Court will submit findings (if high State officer) to secretary of state who will then refer them to appropriate person or legislative body or to Governor to declare election void. Duty of State's attorneys to prosecute whenever they feel they have good reason to believe corrupt practices involved. ¹
Maine	Imprisonment for not more than 6 months or fine of not more than \$500.		Officer in charge of receiving statements notifies attorney general who, if satisfied there is cause, shall institute civil proceedings or refer case to district attorney for action in criminal courts. Courts may compel filing of statement on application of attorney general or district attorney or petition of any candidate voted for, or any 5 persons qualified to vote at election on account of which expenditures were made.
Maryland	Person can't take office, collect salaries, or receive certificate of nomination or election until he has filed account. Fine up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Fine of up to \$1,000 and/or imprisonment up to 2 years.	Alleged violations reported to prosecuting attorney or attorney general who shall institute civil or criminal proceedings.
Massachusetts	No name on ballot. Candidate disqualified from holding public office. Gross misdemeanor.	Same as for failure to file.	County attorney shall inquire into and prosecute cases which come to his notice.
Michigan	Willful and deliberate violations shall be punishable by fine not more than \$500 and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year. Forfeited nomination or general election.	do	Petition for judicial review of election may be made.
Minnesota	Fined not more than \$1,000. Can't take office until statement is filed. ²	Forfeiture of election	Person receiving next highest vote may petition attorney general for action against successful candidate upon posting \$1,000 bond. If attorney general does not prosecute in 10 days, applicant may prosecute at his own expense (for excessive or illegal expenditures). Electors may file petition contesting election with court, must post bond up to \$2,000, on basis of illegal or excessive expenditures. Official receiving statements shall notify prosecutor.
Mississippi	\$25 per day while in default. Name won't be printed on ballot and no certificate of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Fine up to \$5,000 and/or up to 1 year in jail.	Voters may file complaint with State attorney general to have him prosecute. In cases involving members of the State legislature, a voter may file a complaint with the legislature, which shall hear and determine cases of contested election of its members and for all officers of the executive department of the State.
Missouri	Candidate: Fine up to \$1,000. No certification of nomination or election; can't take office. Treasurer: Fine \$50 to \$500; further failure after notice to comply—jail 2 to 6 months. ⁴	Fine up to \$50 and/or jail 6 months.	Any person voted for at an election for any office, or any voter, may make a complaint in writing to attorney general of any violation. Any person may bring proceeding in equity against primary candidate who violates law to disqualify him from ensuing election.
Montana	Willful violations of rules relating to primary may disqualify candidate from ensuing election. Not entitled to nomination or election until filing. Fine \$100 to \$1,000 and/or 30 days to 6 months in jail.	Same as penalty for failure to file except no refusal of certification.	Voters may contest election on ground of illegal or excessive expenditures. If candidate has taken office, attorney general shall institute appropriate proceedings for vacation of such office; or shall notify appropriate legislative body to which candidate was elected.
Nevada	Office forfeited by nonfiling of statement or filing of false statement. Court may also disenfranchise voter and disqualify him from holding office in State for period of time. Candidate at primary election with next highest number of votes shall be put on ballot.	Office forfeited. Same as for failure to file. Persons making unauthorized expenditures are guilty of a misdemeanor.	
New Hampshire	Primary election: No certificate of nomination; no name on ballot; fine of \$25 to \$500. General election: Can't take office; no certificate of election; fine up to \$500. ³	Primary election: Fine of \$100 to \$2,000 and imprisonment for 6 months to 2 years. General election: Same as for failure to file.	
New Jersey	Guilty of misdemeanor; imprisonment up to 1 year and/or fine of \$100 to \$500.	Same as for failure to file.	Court, in proceeding instituted by candidate or 3 qualified voters, may compel persons or committees to file statement, to make statement conform to law, or to comply with any other provisions of section. Court may require bond and sureties from petitioner.
New Mexico			
New York			

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 4.—Penalties and provisions for enforcement—Continued

State	Penalty for failure to file	Penalty for excessive or illegal expenditures	Enforcement of penalties
North Carolina	Misdemeanor; fine and/or imprisonment. Court may remove from office and declare ineligible to hold office for 2 years.	Same as for failure to file.	Duty of secretary of state and superior court clerks to call for required statements and report violations to attorney general, who should initiate prosecution.
North Dakota	Fine of \$25 per day while in default; name can't go on ballot until report is filed.	Deprivation of nomination for office.	Offender deprived of office by contest proceedings.
Ohio	No certificate of nomination or election until report is filed. Failure to file within time limit shall disqualify said person from becoming candidate in any future election for period of 5 years; candidates for an elected office having a 6-year term shall be disqualified from becoming a candidate in any future election for a period of 7 years. Failure to file at any time: Fine \$25 to \$500 and/or jail 10 days to 6 months.	Forfeiture of nomination or election; same as for failure to file. Fine \$100 to \$500 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Secretary of state notifies attorney general of violation and he must prosecute. Citizens may present petition to court of common pleas or any judge thereof, with security, but election law does not specifically provide for any special procedure for citizens' prosecutions in this area.
Oklahoma	Candidate: Misdemeanor; fine of \$25 to \$500 and imprisonment 5 to 30 days. No certification of nomination. ⁵	Guilty of misdemeanor; fined \$100 to \$2,000 and jail for 6 months to 2 years; candidate to be barred from holding office in State.	Prosecution by county attorneys.
Oregon	Candidate: Fine \$25 per day while in default; no name on ballot and no certification of election.	Deprivation of nomination or office. Can't hold any office during term for which he was nominated or elected. Jail up to 1 year and/or fine up to \$5,000.	District attorney required to prosecute alleged violations which come to his attention from election officials or from complaints and notices by citizens under penalty of forfeiture of office.
Pennsylvania	Can't take oath of office, take office, or receive salary until all statements filed. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or 1 month to 2 years in jail.	Ousted from office or from nomination. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail 1 month to 2 years. Willful violation by candidate disqualifies him forever from holding public office in State; willful violation by any person requires disenfranchisement for 4 years.	Any 5 electors may petition court for an audit; district attorney must institute criminal proceedings. If it appears that candidate has violated these sections, attorney general shall institute quo warranto proceedings against such candidate for ouster from nomination or from office.
Rhode Island			
South Carolina	Election null and void. Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	Misdemeanor; fine \$100 to \$500 or imprisonment at hard labor 1 to 6 months, or both at the discretion of the court.	
South Dakota	Forfeiture of office; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Same as for failure to file.	Attorney general investigates and prosecutes.
Tennessee	No certificate of nomination or election. Fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 30 days to 12 months.		
Texas	Fine \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years. Forfeit right to place name on ballot at any subsequent primary, special, or general election. If he fails to report any receipt or expenditure, liable for double the amount or value to each opposing candidate and also for reasonable attorneys' fees.	Candidate and campaign managers civilly liable to each opposing candidate for double the amount or value of such unlawful campaign expenditures and reasonable attorney fees for collecting the same. Also, fine of \$100 to \$5,000 and/or jail 1 to 5 years.	Quo warranto proceedings may be instituted in district courts.
Utah	Name won't be printed on ballot for ensuing election; disqualified from holding office until statement is filed. ¹	Election voided; person ousted and excluded from office; misdemeanor. ¹	Filing officer inspects statements and reports violations to county attorney who must institute proceedings if evidence is sufficient; candidates or voters may complain to filing officer of violations or may petition district judge, Attorney general, or Governor to investigate alleged violation.
Vermont	Fine up to \$500 and/or jail up to 6 months.	Fine up to \$500 or jail up to 90 days.	
Virginia	No certification of election; can't take office; misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Election declared null and void.	
Washington			
West Virginia	Misdemeanor; fine not less than \$50, and/or jail not more than 1 year. No name on ballot; no certification of election.	Disqualified from holding any public office or employment during period of 5 years subsequent to date of conviction. Vacate office.	Prosecutor notified for appropriate action.
Wisconsin	No name on ballot; no certification. Failure to file on part of treasurer or political committee is punishable by 2 to 6 months in jail.	Voiding of election and ousting and excluding candidate from office. ¹	Any elector may petition for permission to bring charges against candidate or committee for alleged violation.
Wyoming	No name on ballot; no certification of election. Misdemeanor; fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Misdemeanor. Fine up to \$1,000 and/or jail up to 1 year.	Upon notice by filing officer or petition by voter, county or prosecuting attorney must prosecute alleged violation.

¹ Findings are certified to presiding officer of appropriate legislative body in case of a violation by any of its members.

² Filing officer must notify delinquent of his failure to file and, if the latter has not expended more than allowed, and files within 10 days of receipt of this notice, he will not be assessed the penalties provided.

³ Failure to file on part of treasurer of political committee subject to fine of \$50 to \$500; if treasurer receives notice from 5 resident freeholders and still fails to file, jail for 2 to 6 months.

⁴ Failure to file on part of committee treasurer subject to fine of \$50 to \$500; failure to file after notice, jail for 2 to 6 months.

⁵ For treasurers of political committees, fine is \$50 to \$500 and/or 6 months in jail.

⁶ Penalty for violation by committee is a fine of \$25 to \$500 and imprisonment for 3 to 12 months.

⁷ Penalty for committee treasurers is 2 to 6 months in jail.

Mr. Speaker, with this background, we can compare the election laws of the various States with the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925 which governs the spending of campaign funds by Federal candidates. On June 10, 1966, Life magazine discussed the act in an editorial. That editorial said in part:

The Corrupt Practices Act of 1925—the law that still regulates campaign spending—was aptly named. If ever a law was designed to promote corrupt practices, this is it. For instance, it provides that a congressman can spend only \$5,000 in a bid for election and a senator \$25,000. But it sets no limit on the number of outside committees that can help by spending an equal amount. Thus, a senatorial candidate has to maintain the fiction that the dozen or more committees set up to accept donations for his cause do so without his "knowledge or consent."

The extent of this and other shenanigans can be gauged by the fact that all parties reported total expenses across the country in the '64 election as \$47.8 million. A reliable estimate of the amount actually spent, starting with the primaries, puts it at \$200 million.

Much of the other \$150 million did not have to be reported to the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate. And even the transactions that should have been reported—but weren't—will never be investigated. Justice Department policy is "not to institute investigations . . . in the absence of a request from the Clerk of the House of Representatives or Secretary of the Senate." Since both of those men are elected by the houses they serve, it is not surprising that neither has ever asked for an investigation of any member's election.

The problem this Congress faces is threefold. It is first of all important that Members of Congress include as part of the public record their assets, liabilities, and sources of income. We must also move to establish standards of conduct for Members of the House.

Secondly, we must insure in this country the highest possible degree of honesty in elections by instituting full disclosure of campaign funds. We must also make available a means for many more people to financially aid in the election of his favorite candidate or party.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, we must establish a method of enforcing these procedures. We must take out of the hands of the employees of the House and Senate and place in a National Commission

and a Joint Ethics Committee the power to punish violators of the election code and judge the conduct of Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the bill of the resolution I have introduced today would accomplish these important tasks. These are important steps in the long road toward strengthening the legislative branch of Government and insuring the continued viability of our republican form of government. As the Madison, Wis., Capital Times said on Monday, February 20, 1967:

The issue of ethics in government continues to haunt politicians and public. There is a disposition on the part of both to ignore it. But it keeps popping up. The politicians try to give the impression that the issue doesn't exist but they also devoutly wish it would go away. The public doesn't like to be reminded of unpleasant things—such as the waywardness of the men they elect to public office. But if these things are not called to public attention and discussed, it would be a question of time before free government would collapse from the unbearable burden of corruption it would have to support.

I trust the Congress will consider this matter in the very near future and will act favorable on these proposals.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin and I would like to emphasize the importance of his comments on these provisions so far as the election law goes. Certainly, it is only fair that a candidate be required to report and be subject to the same requirements imposed upon him as any Member of this body.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas and the entire freshman group of Republican Members of the 90th Congress for his and their leadership in suggesting this code of ethics.

As one who entered the House during the 89th Congress, but just now, with you, approaches a first full term, I am in full agreement that the ethical standards of the House and the Congress should be high and equally applicable to all Members. Appropriate action must and will be taken to assure this, and your proposal is a very good first step.

I came here from the New York City Council last year. We there had a very stringent code of ethics for a legislative body, and it was a salutary thing. The Congress can well take heed in this area of New York City's example.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER].

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join a large number of freshmen Congressmen in offering resolutions to establish an Ethics Committee for the House and also to change the rules of this House to provide for the disclosure of assets and the disclosure of nepotism.

Last week, we received the report of the President's Crime Commission. The cost and extent of criminal behavior prevalent in our country must be a mat-

ter of great concern to all of us. Not many Americans escape the sweep of its indictment, either as participants or indifferent bystanders.

This past weekend we learned of cheating scandals in one of our service academies.

On Wednesday of this week we will consider a report concerning the conduct of a Congressman-elect.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Americans are sick of feeling soiled by the times in which they live. If this is indeed a sickness, the people expect the Congress to be a physician, not one of the patients.

We have all heard the old bromide that you cannot legislate morality. That does not mean we many not exemplify morality. That does not mean that we cannot make the practice of immorality more difficult.

If this House cannot bestir itself to clean its own affairs, how, Mr. Speaker, can we expect to clean our streams, clean our air, and reduce crime on a national scale? If we cannot take this small step now, we jeopardize for a long time to come our reputation and the confidence Americans want so desperately to feel in their Congress. This resolution cannot be opposed on the basis of too great an expense, nor should it be opposed on grounds of partisanship. The Good Book says there is a time and a season for the events of life and history. This is the season and now is the time to set our house in order.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I am pleased to join him in his essential objective.

Mr. Speaker, as a general rule for better Government operation I prefer better and more effective use of existing committees rather than the addition of new ones. Those who are critical of the proliferation of committees perform an important public service.

The Adam Clayton Powell case now confronts us with the question of whether existing facilities, specifically the House Administration Committee, is the appropriate vehicle to respond to the present overriding demand of the American people, and our own deep desires, that rules of standards and conduct of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives be more clearly defined, be raised to a higher plateau, and be more effectively enforced. I should like to commend the members of the House Administration Committee on their efficient examination of facts in the Powell case and for the high quality of their service. It is now my belief that this House must establish stronger and more tangible rules than have been previously considered necessary, and stronger enforcement and investigatory procedure than has previously sufficed. The matter of standards and conduct of Members has become, in my opinion, a subject for an exclusive responsibility of the select committee which this resolution creates.

The creation of the select committee

is another acknowledgment that conduct and standards of members of the U.S. House of Representatives are expected to be far superior to those expected of others.

The addition of a rule requiring comprehensive disclosure of assets, liabilities, special interests, substantial income, gifts, and reimbursements to Members and those employees and officers of the House who are compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 annually is likewise subject to the general suspicion that such disclosure requirements may serve to mislead, to hide and protect the cleverly unethical, rather than to actually disclose the personal gains and benefits derived from political influence. But here again, it is my belief in view of the heavy responsibilities which we bear as Members of this House, that we cannot surrender to a fatalistic attitude that no improvement is possible, and that it is now our opportunity and bounden responsibility to forge a meaningful upgrading in the rules which govern standards and conduct of Members of the House of Representatives.

I join in the introduction of the resolution.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Utah for that statement.

Before yielding further, I would like to note for the RECORD our pleasure at having the gentleman from Florida in the Speaker's chair. He has, perhaps, done more in this body than any other Member to fight for a strong code of ethics. I believe it is altogether appropriate that we be speaking here while he is presiding. I believe further it is altogether appropriate that he is here when we new Republican Members are speaking out for many of the things for which he has been fighting for many years.

At this point I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCURE].

Mr. McCURE. Mr. Speaker, I wish, first, to congratulate the gentleman from Texas for his effort in bringing this matter to the floor and for the efforts he has extended so far in coordinating the efforts of those of us who are appearing in support of this legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we in the House of Representatives must put aside consideration of such pressing problems as the Vietnamese conflict to discuss the personal conduct of Members of Congress. But the fact remains that before we can expect the people to respect the laws we make, there must be respect for the lawmakers themselves.

There are those who will question the propriety of freshman Congressmen taking the floor to propose ethical standards for all Members, most of whom are many years our senior. As for myself, I can only reply that it was not necessary for me to be elected to Congress to be endowed with the capacity to tell right from wrong.

Furthermore, I feel certain that the big turnover in the congressional elections last fall was in no small measure due to a lack of public confidence in governmental officials on all levels. The reasons were not hard to find: a Senate employee who had used his position for

personal gain, talk of a credibility gap, the personal conduct of certain Members of Congress themselves. If those of us who were suddenly thrust into positions of leadership do not seek to restore confidence in public officials, then the American people have merely traded tweedle-dee for tweedledum. I, of course, do not refer to those Members who have been returned.

It is most gratifying to me to find so many of the new Congressmen responding to this challenge with proposals for putting our house in order. The diverse approaches in our bills illustrate the many paths available to us. None of those participating in the discussion today are being so presumptuous as to say we have all the answers. On the contrary, each of us has been encouraged to suggest varying methods for establishing ethical standards in order that the Congress may choose the best from each.

It is in this spirit that I have today introduced a resolution on ethics and disclosure. My bill differs from the basic measure being offered by the gentlemen from Texas and others in several significant respects.

For one thing, I suggest a revolving membership for the proposed Committee on Standards and Conduct. No Member should be permitted to sit in judgment of other Members for a prolonged period of time.

My resolution authorizes the proposed committee to issue advisory opinions, upon request, when a Member is uncertain as to whether or not some course of action open to him is ethical.

I have also proposed penalties, and I suggest that where there is a finding of willful violation of the House rules, the recommendation must be expulsion. And if the House agrees to the recommendation, the Member expelled may never again serve in a Government position, elective or otherwise, except for the military.

I have not attempted to define a code of ethics, but the committee is required under my bill to issue its first recommendations by August 31 of this year. I would expect that report to contain a code of ethics at that time.

The Select Committee on Standards and Conduct is expected, of course, to devise a code of ethics. In this connection, I would expect the committee to consider such matters as disclosure of confidential information acquired during official duties for personal gain; the acceptance of gifts; pressuring employees to make contributions to political and charitable organizations; use of the franking privilege and abuse of the accounts available to us for running a congressional office; or, for that matter, slush funds and the use of campaign contributions for personal purposes. Likewise, the committee should formulate rules by which communications between a Member and an agency with respect to any adjudicatory matter or rulemaking would be made a part of the public record of that proceeding. I would suggest to the committee that where it is difficult to translate ethical standards into legislative form, the oath be rewritten to include those provisions.

I hope it never becomes necessary for the proposed committee to investigate a Member. But if it does, there will be no doubt that the House of Representatives is prepared to discipline its own. Creating the committee will, at the very least, remove from partisan politics such unpleasant matters as the one we must face on Wednesday.

Most of the bills being introduced today require each Member to file annually a public statement of his personal holdings. My bill will extend most of these requirements to candidates for the House of Representatives. This requirement should cause no embarrassment to anyone who is truly above suspicion, for we are indeed public servants.

If, when history judges the record of the 90th Congress, it can be said that this was the time when the faith in the Congress was restored to the American people, then it can also be written that this was the time when the principle of representative government was reaffirmed and freedom did indeed flourish.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. I should like to take this opportunity to applaud the fine statement just made by the gentleman from Idaho and to draw particular attention to one point he made; that is, our discussion today and the bills and resolutions we offer are presented with the complete and wholehearted support of the party leaders. I believe it is important to point out for the country that we discussed our intention with our party leaders and received full encouragement from them to proceed in this manner. This is important to recognize. I would underscore that statement.

Mr. BUSH. I commend the gentleman from Michigan, and I agree totally. I am glad the gentleman brought out that additional information.

Mr. McCLURE. I thank the gentleman for his comment. This is one thing I wish to underscore; the fact that we are not talking behind the backs of our elders. We have their support. This is important.

I commend the gentleman for making this addition to my comments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every body of men engaged in a common task, seeking a common objective, and working together to achieve a common end should, as a matter of course, have the benefit of a common set of rules to guide them in their personal conduct as a member of that body.

I speak of the advisability of having a code of ethics governing the conduct and standards of Members of Congress. After all, we are here only for one purpose, and that purpose is to serve our constituency and our country in an able and honorable way. But, considering the relative values we all possess, it does seem presumptuous to expect every

Member of this large body to hold identical sets of values where their conduct in relation to this body is concerned.

It seems to me, therefore, that if we had an established set of rules, which were unquestionably enforced, they would help each of us to serve our constituency and country in the able and honorable way expected of us. This would materially benefit this Congress by allowing it to proceed with its important work, secure in the knowledge that each Member is aware of his obligations, and will abide by them once he is so apprised.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt consideration of this resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and establishing clear-cut requirements for Members of this House of Representatives.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman for his timely comments.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a deep concern over recent acts that have cast dark shadows of doubt over the entire Congress in the minds of the people of the United States.

Today, I have introduced a separate resolution that, like others introduced here today, would create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

However, on the matter of disclosure of financial interests, my resolution differs from others. The difference is in the method of disclosure and in the teeth put into the requirement for accurate disclosure.

This resolution would require Members and certain employees to file annually with the Comptroller General of the United States a copy of their financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. The latter, of course, would require further implementing legislation. Under my resolution, the Comptroller General of the United States and the select committee would be authorized to examine these financial reports and, should they find anything wrong, would be empowered to conduct such investigations as they deemed necessary. Reports of wrongdoings would be filed by the Comptroller General with the Justice Department and with the House for appropriate action.

As a new Member of this body, and as the single Representative from the State of Delaware to this body, I urge the passage of this bill to establish in the House an effective body to investigate and act on allegations of misconduct of Members and of staff members so that the American people will not continue to have reservations regarding the integrity of this body and reservations regarding its willingness to condone the actions of Members and staff members guilty of misconduct.

Justice for Members and staff members who might be accused, as well as, public demand for the highest standards of conduct by Members and their staffs, makes imperative the immediate establishment of this Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—and certain

amendments to House rules that will provide the means to quickly ferret out any who might be guilty of misconduct.

Under the resolution that I have introduced, a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct would be established, having a membership composed of 12 members divided evenly between the majority and minority parties. It would be empowered to recommend rules and regulations it deems necessary to insure proper standards of conduct by Members and by staff members of the House. It would have authority to investigate alleged breaches of conduct, recommend appropriate action and report violations of law to the proper Federal and State authorities.

Further, the resolution I offer would amend the rules of the House to require that Members and their employees who are paid more than \$10,000 annually file with the Comptroller General of the United States a financial statement and a copy of their income tax return. This closely parallels a proposal made in the other body by the senior member of the congressional delegation from Delaware.

This section of my resolution differs from others in that the others require only the filing of a financial statement.

The difference is in the amount of teeth we want to put in legislation requiring disclosure of financial interests. A financial statement can reflect as much or as little as the preparer wishes it to reflect. Most of us would report assets and liabilities to the letter and intent of the law. However, it is not the actions of most of us that have caused us concern, and that recently have caused a decline in the respect of the House by the American people.

On the other hand, an individual could, if he so desired, simply file an incomplete financial statement—there seems to be no punishment for that—or could conceal his assets in the names of other parties.

By the requirement to have Members and certain staff members file a copy of their annual income tax return along with their financial statement, we would give teeth to the requirement for accurate disclosure of financial interests. While there may be no penalties for filing an incomplete financial statement, there are severe penalties for filing a false income tax return. And the proper filing of the latter with the Comptroller General of the United States would prompt complete and accurate disclosure of the former.

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. COWGER].

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Texas, and the other new Members of Congress for their sincere interest in establishing rules of conduct for the Congress. It is quite obvious that public opinion dictates a firm and clear statement of principles from all of us—new and old, important and the new and the mighty, rich and poor, Republican and Democrat.

I am in complete favor with this bill and urge its adoption. We must have a strong measure—if not this one—then, at least another that will be equally as demanding. For my part, I intend to immediately comply with the spirit of this bill, by furnishing to the Clerk of the Congress, a complete statement of my assets, my interests, and my income. It is hoped that all our other colleagues will join us in this endeavor.

Thank you.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished president of the new Republican Members of this Congress, and thank him for those comments.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with many of my colleagues in calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, and for the establishment of requirements calling for disclosure of assets and liabilities, and certain business, lobby, and nepotism relationships.

As we all know, Congress adopted a "code of ethics" in July 1958, that was intended to apply to all individuals in Government service. Regrettably, the wording of the code is, of necessity, general, and therefore lacking in strength. It has no muscle.

Our effort today is an attempt to add strength to the "code of ethics" that now exists. In my mind, it is good that this is being attempted in a positive light and not in a negative—do not do—manner.

President Calvin Coolidge said:

Little progress can be made by merely attempting to repress what is evil; our hope lies in developing what is good.

Today, the 90th Congress is being challenged to develop what is good.

The resolution that I introduce today calls for the public recording of those relationships and situations which, in some cases, are considered questionable. The resolution does not say that the hiring of relatives is all bad. It does not say the business connections are all bad. It does not say that communications with lobbyists are bad. What it does say is that these relationships should be recorded in such a way that the public can observe them and determine when "conflicts of interest" exist.

John C. Calhoun observed that—

The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices a public trust.

Hopefully, the resolution here offered will make it possible for the public to evaluate the manner in which these officerholders honor this trust.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for this time.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for those comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] and many of my other colleagues in introducing this ethics and disclosure resolution. Since my election last November, I have heard from many of my constituents who seem to be losing their confidence in many of our public officials.

I would like to quote from one letter which expresses a rather harsh and unjustified opinion of Congress:

I, like millions of other Americans, have come to realize that Congress has degenerated to a mere shadow of its once great image. The conduct of many representatives and senators has been highly reprehensible. Now one member is trying to blackmail Congress because he knows that a large number of members are guilty of criminal misconduct and political immorality.

Although I have been in Congress only a short time, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the conduct of one or two Members may have tarnished the good reputation of this great body. There is no doubt in my mind that the great majority of the Members of Congress are of the highest caliber and their integrity is above reproach. I believe this impression must be corrected and that public confidence in Congress must be restored.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope this or similar legislation will be adopted. It will go a long way toward maintaining the faith of the American people in their Government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE], my fellow colleague, and I believe I speak for all when I say that many Members of this Congress have received this type of letter, and many of us know that the people are waiting for the Congress to act in this important field.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

(Mr. PETTIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for his remarks and the initiative he has taken in bringing this issue before the House.

As a newly elected Congressman, I feel certain that there are very few Members on either side of the aisle who do not practice adherence to a high code of personal morality and conduct.

Because of this, there is an almost unanimous concern for the good name of this body on the part of the membership.

In an effort to give these feelings positive form, I have earlier in this session introduced a bill which would bring about changes in the House rules making it impossible for any individual Member of this great body, regardless of race or political status, to corrupt his high office or bring shame on the Congress of the United States.

I feel strongly that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be singled out from our midst to be judged against any special standard against which we are not all ready and willing to be judged.

In order to demonstrate to the people of the entire world in a clear and convincing manner that we are men and women who are as true to duty as the needle to the pole, who do not fear to call sin by its true name, men, and women who will stand for right though the heavens fall, I urge the entire Congress, and particularly the Members who sit in

positions of leadership on both sides of the aisle, to insist upon the immediate study of, and action upon, proposed changes in House rules that will renew public confidence in the integrity and honesty of this bastion of representative government.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska.

(Mr. POLLOCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and the other participating Members of the 90th Club. I am most anxious that we take this decisive step to put our house in order—by boldly introducing legislation to formulate a strong code of ethics.

The present conduct of Members of Congress is of vital concern to every American—it should be of utmost, of paramount, concern to the Members of Congress to meet this issue head on and to do something constructive and meaningful to resolve the problem which confronts us. We are and must ever be servants of the people who choose us to represent them in the U.S. Congress—and we not only must serve with dignity and integrity, but there should be no doubt or cloud in the understanding of the American people. Confidence in all Members of Congress in all their endeavors should never again be shaken.

It is surprising that such a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has not been established long before now. Let us not let another session of Congress become history without enactment of appropriate legislation to establish clearly recognized standards of conduct and ethics.

Today I join in introduction and support of an appropriate resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. There are a number of good approaches to the problem. Let us put our heads together and come out with a good workable solution we can all live with—one that will remove the public cynicism which unfortunately exists today.

I fear no standards which can gauge and measure my personal conduct as a Member of the U.S. Congress. Let us get on with the job which confronts us.

Mr. BUSH. I thank my distinguished colleague from Alaska [Mr. Pollock].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today as one of the cosponsors of this resolution because I deeply believe that it is essential for Congress to act promptly and decisively to preserve what is left of our integrity and respect in the eyes of the American people. Today there is doubt in too many minds across the country about the personal conduct of Members of this body.

In 2 days, we will act on the case of a man who, as a Congressman, used his position in Government for his own per-

sonal gain. The other body of Congress is today conducting a similar investigation into the conduct of one of its Members.

Unfortunately it takes only one corrupt Congressman to seed the false idea that all Members of Congress are guilty of similar indiscretions. Today, much of the growing public cynicism is due to our own ponderous inability to come to grips with the problem of implementing some tough, but fair, standards of personal conduct. It is not enough to just take strong action against the occasional publically identified offender, but we—to a man—must establish and live by the very highest objective public standards of personal conduct. Let us get moving and demonstrate to the American people beyond any doubt that we are deeply honored to serve in our capacity of public trust and wish to act, in every instance, only in the public interest.

Let us establish an objective code of conduct which will apply to all Members of this body by which the activities of each and every Member can be measured. Only with such an overall objective standard of conduct can we eliminate the public doubt that arises when—in the absence of an overall objective standard—one man is singled out and punished for improper conduct.

This resolution is not offered as a cure-all but rather as a long overdue beginning. Certainly it will take good faith and earnest concern of us all if we are to develop and implement a meaningful code of personal conduct. As a freshman Member of this body, I look to my senior colleagues for advice and counsel in this matter, so that we who are new to the House can make full use of the knowledge and experience you represent. But let us get moving—let us quit spinning our wheels. Let us get something done. Let us answer mounting public concern about the integrity of Congress with a hard-hitting, straightforward code of conduct that does the job.

As one Member of this body, I stand ready to work on this issue with any interested Member, on either side of the aisle, for as long as it takes to get this job done. And I suspect it will take determined and unrelenting effort of this kind to finally overcome the inertia and bring about this long overdue reform.

Until such time, however, as an objective code of conduct is operational, I will, as a matter of personal conviction, voluntarily file with the Clerk four annual statements for insertion into the public record.

The first voluntary statement will be full disclosure annually of my earnings and assets and I will shortly supply this statement. And I hasten to add that this is not a new idea with me. During my recent campaign for election, I voluntarily made such a complete public disclosure.

The second annual statement will certify that I have not had any relatives on my congressional payroll or working in any other capacity, with or for, any governmental agency.

The third statement will certify that I have held no interest, personally or beneficially, in any firm that is a major

supplier to Government, or in any firm that operates under direct Government charter or supervision, such as TV stations, airlines, and so forth.

The fourth statement will list all congressional travel expenses incurred by me and reimbursed by the Government.

I will make these statements available for public review because I wish to have my personal conduct in these areas above suspicion—above any lowest denominator of conduct possibly occasioned by some Member who may misuse his position of trust for his own gain.

Mr. BUSH. I would like to commend the forthright statement of the gentleman from Michigan. No Member of our group has helped more and no one has contributed more to this discussion and to the background work that went into it.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and other newly elected Republican Members of the House in urging, as strongly as we can, the appointment of a Select Committee on Ethics and Conduct and proper standards to govern this House.

This committee should recommend rules and regulations necessary or desirable to insure such proper standards of conduct—and not only by Members of the House but also by officers or employees of the House. In my judgment, such rules and regulations should include a provision prohibiting any Member of this House from employing any member of his family on his staff.

I do not think that mere disclosure of such employment is sufficient in view of the mood of this House and the recognition by many Members of the pressing need for meaningful action. I think it is also imperative in view of the mood of the country.

The committee should also be given power to make investigations of the conduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House and in my judgment should be empowered to recommend censure, suspension, or expulsion of any such Member or officer or employee after an investigation—and I wish to emphasize—after a fair and complete hearing.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House Republican policy committee, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas and the other newly elected Members of the Congress from the Republican Party for doing what you have done here today. I think you have done a magnificent job of pointing out the existence of a very important problem. The solution that you offer appears to me to be reasonable, honorable, and just. I think the services that you have rendered will stand the entire House of Representatives in good stead when this very important matter comes before it for deliberation and the

formation or creation of a select committee.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arizona, who is the leader of the Republican policy committee which has already issued, as most of us recognize here today, a forthright statement calling for the selection and establishment of a special Ethics Committee.

It is a great honor to have the gentleman from Arizona commend the new Members for the work they are doing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would once again urge with respect to this very important matter that the House not say it cannot be done, or this is old hat, or that it has been tried.

I urge that we take a new and fresh look at the problem, and I urge the leadership on both sides of the aisle and the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to work diligently and provide not only for the creation of an Ethics Committee, but for the adoption of a meaningful code of ethics which will show the country that we are determined to do something about this ethical cloud that hangs over this illustrious body.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a basic tenet of American democratic philosophy is the proscription that our Nation is to be a government of laws, not men. In order that Congress achieve the ultimate moral strength in its role as the crucible of American laws it must indeed also govern itself under a code of ethics which measures every Member as an equal. No American can feel secure in moral righteousness and punishment vented against any man, unless every man is governed in all respects with the same laws.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have said repeatedly that there can be no compromise with integrity, and that includes the integrity of every Member of Congress as well as anyone else. We have all been honored by our people at home who have charged us with the awesome responsibility of representing them in the Congress of the United States. They expect us to work diligently and honestly in their behalf.

We must never reach a point where we feel that Members of Congress need not adhere to the same high standard of conduct and integrity that is expected of every man and woman in this Nation. In contrast, we should try to be a model for them.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a number of incidents in recent years have made the people suspicious of government. But a good share of the problem does indeed lie with the leaders of government. It is their responsibility to lead the crusade to prove to the people that the Congress and the Government of the United States will insist on absolutely honest and upright conduct by those in public service.

It is necessary for the continuance of representative government in any country, that the citizens who agree to be governed by a system of manmade laws, have continual evidence of the practice of the highest degree of ethics. Faith in our form of government must never be taken for granted. There must

be assurances and protections for U.S. citizens.

One way to help do this, Mr. Speaker, is to establish a code of ethics in Congress which will apply to every man and woman who is commissioned by the people to work here. It should be a code that will make explicit the requirements and responsibilities of the Members.

I have been honored to serve in representative government for 33 years. I hope to continue working to restore the confidence of our citizens in their Legislature. To help achieve that goal, I am proud to join with my colleagues, the newly elected Members of Congress, in this very worthy goal.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a resolution here in the House of Representatives, similar though not identical to that of my colleagues, to establish a House Committee on Ethics and to provide for full disclosure of financial holdings. The events of past weeks have reflected poorly on all Members of the House of Representatives, and, in fact, all Members of Congress. If the legislative branch is to maintain its role as a vital part of our democracy, then it must have the confidence of the American people, and we can hardly ask for or expect to receive that confidence until we are prepared to operate in the light of public disclosure.

My resolution, in addition to establishing an Ethics Committee and requiring full public disclosure of assets and indebtedness, prohibits Members of the House of Representatives from appointing or recommending for appointment any members of their family for positions on the House payroll. I feel that the recent disclosures indicating that a number of Members of Congress had relatives on their payrolls did grievous damage to the image of Congress in the eyes of the American public. Although in most instances expenditures for family members can be quite legitimate, the opportunity for misuse of public funds remains.

In recent months the concept of credibility has been challenged in the executive branch of Government. Respect for the Congress has reached new lows with the disclosure of questionable practices by some of its Members. It falls, then, to the Members of this body to demonstrate to the people of the Nation that we will govern ourselves by rule of law.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, over the years a great national concern has grown about the conduct and practices of Members of Congress. Events of recent months have highlighted this concern, and, if any good can ever come from such circumstances, it will hopefully take the form of greater and continuing efforts at policing ourselves to the degree that assuming the public trust will mean exactly that. For unless we begin to police ourselves effectively, a credibility gap, at least in terms of ethics and conduct, will exist here in the legislative branch, as well as in the executive.

While I join in the introduction of a resolution calling for the establishment of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, I am convinced that our efforts

in this area must attain a high degree of permanency and stability. Perhaps the establishment of a standing committee would best serve this end and develop the type of continuity necessary to treat all Members equally rather than dealing with individual controversies once they have reached the crisis stage.

Our prime goal must be public confidence. The people must not have doubts as to whether Members of this House are expected to live up to high ethical standards. The people have every right to expect their lawmakers not to be law-breakers.

The action of a few can and will reflect on the reputation of the total. Our task must be then, to set standards for all Members so that this body, individually and collectively, will be above suspect.

It is fitting that new Members of the House are speaking out, for our mandate clearly reflects a public concern. May it not fall on closed ears. The immediate public interest and the long-range interests of Congress so demand.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, certainly the public opinion of the U.S. House of Representatives is at a low ebb. In order to counteract this fact, I believe it is necessary for us to take measures to improve the image of the House of Representatives prior to the enactment of legislation determining the future of our fellow citizens. People are entitled to know the financial interests and dealings of their elected officials, and whether any of their relatives are on the Government payroll.

Today I am introducing a resolution establishing a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee, consisting of six Members from each side of the aisle, would have the power to investigate alleged misconduct of Members, officers, and employees of the House. The resolution would also require full disclosure of assets, liabilities, gifts, and so forth, by Members of Congress, their spouses and members of their staffs. It further provides for disclosure of interests on any business dealings with or regulated by the Government, and requires a listing of relatives on the Government payroll. To enforce these disclosures the committee would design appropriate forms to be filled out by the Members, officers and employees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that my colleagues in the 90th Congress show to the American people that we are for integrity in Government by early passage of this resolution.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolutions which have been introduced to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in the House.

As we are all aware, a short-lived version of an ethics committee was established in the waning hours of the 89th Congress. Its powers, however, were severely limited by amendment. In its report to the House, issued last December, it urged that a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct be created by the House in the 90th Congress. The final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the

Congress, issued last July, also recommended the creation of such a select committee in the House. In the other Chamber a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct has been in existence since 1964. The House has been derelict in its failure to follow suit.

At the beginning of this Congress the House refused to seat, pending investigation, a Member of long standing because of apparent—one is compelled to say transparent—abuse of his perquisites and privileges as a Member of the House of Representatives and chairman of an important committee. Allegations of misbehavior on the part of this Member had long been blazoned in the press, yet no investigation of his conduct was forthcoming in the House until the courts in his home State charged him with criminal contempt. This is a sad commentary on the moral conscience of one of the four most powerful governmental institutions in this country. If there had been in existence an ethics committee, empowered to investigate alleged misbehavior by Members of the House, it is certain that this unfortunate oversight would not have occurred.

Public confidence in the Congress has slipped precipitously in the last few years. To restore that confidence it is imperative that we now create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and that we give it the power necessary to insure prompt and effective action when Members of the House abuse their office. The integrity of this body and its Members must not be permitted to be compromised by the deeds of the few. An independent ethics committee is the best guarantor of this.

Mr. Speaker, opinions have been expressed that a Member once brought before such a committee would stand convicted in the public's eye even should the committee exonerate him of all allegation of misbehavior. This contention will not survive scrutiny. This Nation still believes in the innocence of the accused until guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. I see no reason why this high principle of justice will be voided because a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct might investigate a Congressman's behavior. Indeed, a "clean bill of health" from the committee should dispel the doubts and concern which might obtain about a Member's actions. To doubt this indicts the public's sense of fair play, decency, and justice. Let us remember, furthermore, that the purpose of the committee would be not to act as an inquisitor but rather as an investigator. Its purpose would be to ascertain the facts in any case, report these to the House, and recommend a course of action. We are most emphatically not creating a star chamber here.

Mr. Speaker, the entire question of ethical conduct by a Congressman is a thorny thicket. I cannot believe that any significant number of Congressmen deliberately engage in criminal, or even questionable, conduct. Nevertheless, predicaments face us at every turn. One of the most troublesome of these is the difficult and complex matter of conflict of interest. If a Member is a lawyer, for example, he may be uncertain as to which

clients he, or especially the law firm with which he may be associated, may represent in suits involved with the Government. He may own stock and find himself in a perplexing dilemma because a bill on which he should vote for the interest of his constituency also affects his own vested interests.

Then there is the matter of ex parte communications with agencies of the Government on behalf of constituents. What line may he not trespass in this regard as he attempts to hasten action. Then there is that biennial headache of campaign funds.

These are only three problems encountered by virtually every Congressman for which no adequate guides exist. The Code of Ethics passed in 1958, while a step in the right direction, simply fails to provide assistance to a Congressman in these important areas—and others. A real service would be performed by a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct if it were authorized to recommend a more explicit Code of Ethics for Members of the House with regard to these matters. I, for one, would welcome recommendations of this nature from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the force of circumstances and logic clearly support the creation of a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. Temerity and not timidity is the order of the day.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined a number of my colleagues in the introduction of the ethics and disclosure bill. Passage of this legislation will provide a uniform standard by which all Members of Congress can be judged by the American people. It is our position that no duly elected individual Member of Congress should be judged against any special standard against which all Members are not ready and willing to be judged.

The bill is well conceived, Mr. Speaker, and it stands as a genuine contribution to the establishment of a uniform standard of conduct for the Members of this House. I strongly urge immediate study of and consideration on this important legislation.

This bill is identical to Mr. Bush's.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my colleagues in support of a bill to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. The creation of this committee is vital to restore the confidence of the American people in this Congress and to insure that the present and future Congresses will warrant such confidence and respect.

The American public is entitled to expect from their elected Representatives and the officers and employees of this House, superior standards of conduct. We, as public servants, are entrusted with the responsibility of providing fair and representative government for the welfare of this great Nation. In order to do this, our behavior and conduct must be of the highest quality.

This select committee, which is similar to the one established in the 89th Congress, is desirable for the guidance and protection of Members and House employees. It has become apparent that in order for Members and employees of

this House to give proper and adequate service to the public, standards and a supervisory body must be established.

I believe that this committee, along with the standards it will establish, will provide a suitable deterrent to those who might be tempted to put personal ambition ahead of service to their country. This committee will serve as a guarantee that the Members of the House of Representatives and its employees will meet their sworn obligation to serve God and country.

Tomorrow I will introduce a resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, similar to the resolutions introduced by my colleagues. In addition to creating a Select Committee, this bill will amend the Rules of the House of Representatives by adding rule XLIII. The new rule requires that each Member, officer and employee of the House of Representatives will file the following information with the Clerk of the House:

First, the name and address of any business which is Government controlled or licensed in which the individual has a financial interest, second, the name and address of any professional firm which engages in practice before any department, agency or instrumentality of the United States in which the individual has a financial interest, and third, the name of each person employed by the U.S. Government who is a member of the family or other relative of a Member of the House of Representatives.

The responsibility is upon each of us as Members of the House of Representatives to provide such measures which will insure that all Members, officers and employees of this House will fulfill their sworn duty.

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally. Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to: first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, held by them, their spouses or any staff members making more than \$15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest,

either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government, and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. President, I am convinced that this kind of gesture of honorability is desperately required at this time in our history.

The credibility gap—not only with regard to the conduct of Congressmen—has now grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue, it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of left-wing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime on the streets, to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, perhaps at no time in this century has the Congress been more sharply studied by the public gaze than the present. Perhaps at no time in recent memory has the reputation of Congress with its collective membership been subject to such popular criticism and censure as today. The tragic and thoughtless behavior of a tiny element of this House has reaped publicity of an adverse nature far in excess of the quantity of the issue. Unfortunately, all Congress is now suspect. Honest, decent, and ethical men have been forced to stand in the baleful light of mistrust that has radiated from the machinations of the few.

Our linen is now on the line. And, as long as it is there, it would be timely to apply some new detergents to the wash and give the American people a whiter and brighter deal. I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing my own package of soap in the form of an ethics and disclosure bill. Such legislation, like soap, must be more than chosen or passed upon. Ethics do not become a permanent state of affairs from the adoption of such a bill any more than laundry becomes perpetually radiant through one pass in the washer. It takes constant dedication and application to accomplish both jobs.

The bills introduced by myself and my colleagues are only a beginning. The real enforceability of congressional

ethics lies in the inner person of the individual Member. The workability of any such system lies with each of us. As with a religious creed, acceptance must be essentially voluntary in nature.

But today we may choose to begin. Today we must answer a trust, one arising from the biennial mandate of a people that have the right to expect the best from their elected representatives. We can give them no less.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I am introducing legislation today designed to strengthen public confidence in congressional ethics.

The current public image of Congress demands that we address ourselves to the need for tighter standards of conduct for the legislative branch of Government. Some 60 percent of those answering a recent Gallup poll said they believe the misuse of Government funds by Congressmen is fairly common. Of course, we know that such abuses are, in fact, not common, but there have been a number of such polls showing a distressing lack of public faith in the integrity of public officials. The number of identical and similar measures being introduced today demonstrates to the Nation a great desire, particularly on the part of those of us who are newly elected, for some positive steps in this important area.

I am aware that Congress does now have a code of ethics to which any person in Government service should adhere. Unfortunately, the best of codes will not provide a guarantee against occasional misbehavior by Members. Therefore, there is a need for a vehicle in the House to achieve and maintain the highest possible standards by statute with provisions for enforcement thereof. To fill this need, I am introducing legislation to amend the rules of the House in such a manner as to encourage compliance with regard to ethical conduct by compelling public disclosure of financial assets, potential conflicts of interests, and other areas in which Members or their staffs might find themselves—and, thereby, the Congress as an institution—open to public criticism.

I recognize that disclosure is a thorny problem to many of my colleagues, because public officials are also citizens with personal assets and aspirations and who quite naturally feel these matters are private in nature. However, I believe disclosure can be one more effective way to protect the integrity of elective office. As a Michigan State senator, I voted in favor of such a disclosure bill last year. Since its passage, I have found the statute not only helps insure that the public interest will be safeguarded but it can serve as a protective device for legislators against unwarranted charges leveled against them.

Personally, I do not believe it is possible to legislate morality. But it has never been more important than it is today—when we are engaged in a life and death struggle with tyranny—to maintain confidence in our governmental institutions and to strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. Over the past few years, there have been several highly publicized stories of alleged misconduct by a few

Members of Congress and a few employees. These escapades have hurt the collective reputation of the Congress and of its Members. Wrongdoing must be punished and public faith in the legislative branch must be restored. I believe this legislation will go a long way toward accomplishing these objectives. We can do no less for our constituents and our country.

When an organization finds its reputation tarnished, action must be taken. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that corrective action in the form I have suggested, while not a guarantee against "bad apples in the barrel," will at least give the public its rightful opportunity to identify those apples which are less than thoroughly wholesome.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with the other Members of the 90th Congress in support of a resolution to establish a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Events of the past few months have made it crystal clear that such a committee is needed and that the procedures and committees as presently constituted in the House are inadequate to survey the standards and conduct of the Members.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see the active interest and genuine concern expressed here today by the freshman Republican Members of the 90th Congress, in this united effort to demonstrate that they are concerned about the failing image of Congress, and want to take positive, remedial action.

The Congress has demanded high standards of conduct from other Government officials, particularly members of the Cabinet. It is time that those Members who are concerned, those Members who make up the vast majority of honest and hard-working Congressmen, those Members who are striving to serve their constituents in an effective and meaningful way—it is time that these Members not only ask but demand that this House be put in order.

Mr. Speaker, that demand is being made today. It is being made not only on the floor of this House, but wherever people gather to discuss the affairs of their Nation. The concern expressed here by the new Members of Congress is reflective of a greater public feeling that the time has come to put this House in order.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, everybody's talking about crime and pointing a finger at the youth of our land as the guilty party. The phrase "juvenile delinquency" has become a frequent part of our conversation.

It is said that 20 percent of our population is 18 or below, and that 50 percent of the crime is committed by young people in this category. However, less than 5 percent of the teenagers commit the crimes. But teenagers—all of them, are labeled with this stigma.

We have something akin to this in the Congress of the United States. One Member has flaunted his disregard for the honesty and dignity of Congress, and so a cloud is cast over the whole. People do not say, one man or a few men are

guilty. No, they say, "Congress—Congress is like a barrel of rotten apples, each contaminating the others."

I ask, What kind of an example is that for the youth of our land? I say, let us clean our own house before pointing to youth and the misdemeanors and crimes of youth. We, ourselves, are on trial. Let us purge ourselves.

For this reason, I have this day introduced a bill known as the ethics and disclosure bill.

The general purpose of this bill involves five items:

First. Establish a select committee of the House called the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

Second. Provide a full disclosure of assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth, by Members, their spouses, and staff members, whose salaries exceed \$15,000 gross annually.

Third. Provide a full disclosure of interest, either through financial connection or kinship, with any firm practicing before any agency of the United States.

Fourth. Provide a full disclosure of interest, regardless of amount, in television and radio stations, banks, savings and loan institutions, airlines, and any other business whose right to conduct business is regulated by the Federal Government. Percentage of ownership and fair market value of interest are required for disclosure—exemption here for listed securities in this type of enterprise.

Fifth. Provide disclosure of relatives on the Government payroll, including wives, husbands, sons or daughters, grandsons or granddaughters, mothers and fathers of the Members or his spouse.

Sixth. Require a complete disclosure form to be designed to include the second, third, fourth, and fifth items above. Also require change in clerk-hire form to require clerks to reveal relationship, if any, to Member.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, one thing that has been overlooked by the public and by Members of the House somewhat in this discussion on ethics in Government, is that one of the needs for such a committee is to improve the image of Congress. Most of us know that most Members of Congress are above reproach. As a part of discussing what would be done to eliminate violations of standards in the few instances when it may arise, it would be worth while to discuss for a minute or two, the fact that the bringing about of this committee would really establish a bill of rights for Members because the legislative history of the bringing about of this committee shows clearly the following rights would be established:

First, that, as I said in the first hearing of the Committee on Standards and Conduct, October 20, 1966:

I do not think a man's private life is detrimental to the House. No one is perfect, and if he privately has weaknesses, it should not be something that should come before this committee, as it would not reflect upon the House.

Second, that a Member is entitled to his own political views and such would not be the subject of inquiry by this committee, and no such power would be

given to the committee under the proposed statute.

Third, that no trivial or frivolous matter would come before the committee, and this would be protected by the requirement that any complaint would have to be under oath and in writing, and backed up by competent evidence, and be presented to the committee by a Member of the House, and even then, the committee would have discretion to fail to investigate it if it so decided.

Fourth, that no ex post facto hearings would be held, that is, a person could not be charged for doing something that occurred before the Congress had set up the standard by action of the full House.

Fifth, that the committee could help to make definite, realistic guides for conduct by not only helping to prohibit the bad but also by making definite what is proper, thus evading "throwing out the baby with the bathwater."

Finally, I would like to say that in my opinion, it is just as important to protect Members of Congress from being hurt by unfounded accusations as it is to root out the few isolated cases of misbehavior.

ETHICS OF CONGRESS

(Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. Gude) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply encouraging to me to see the determination of our remarkable group of first-term minority Members to make a contribution toward the resolution of one of the thorniest problems facing the Congress, the question of the proper means of insuring the ethical conduct of the Members of this body. I congratulate them.

In deciding, as a group, to address themselves to this issue, our colleagues have displayed an alert sensitivity both to the moral responsibility of the House to take effective action in this field and to the proper opinion of the people we represent.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that more senior Members of this body should view with more than ordinary significance this action of our junior colleagues. Our newer Members are in a position to see this institution with somewhat greater detachment and objectivity, perhaps, than those who have served here much longer. Having been constituents themselves only a few short weeks ago, they may speak with greater authority about the attitudes of the people we represent toward Congress' long-standing reluctance to insist on the highest standards of ethical conduct.

They know, Mr. Speaker, that the people are troubled about their Congress. They recognize that when doubt and suspicion beset this representative institution, we cannot do our jobs properly. They understand that the responsibility is upon all of us—junior and senior alike—to remedy this unfortunate situation. I welcome, therefore, their sound judgment and their mature determination to act.

To elaborate somewhat on my own view of the need we face and of the actions I believe we should take without further delay, I include as part of my remarks the text of the first of my bi-weekly radio reports in the 90th Congress, which I recorded on Wednesday, February 8:

Since this is my first broadcast of the new 90th Congress, and since we are still in the organizational stages of the new session, I was inclined to devote these remarks to a review of some of the major issues we will be facing here. There are plenty—taxes, government reorganization, air and water pollution are obvious examples. And always at issue will be the amount of money we can afford to spend for the multitude of objectives—some essential, some questionable—which earlier Congresses have authorized.

But on reflection, as a believer in priorities, I've decided that first things really should come first.

First among the first, in my judgment, is the matter of integrity, Congressional integrity. It is the foundation of representative government. It colors everything Congress does. It determines the confidence which people may have in their Government, the respect they may hold for the laws, the effectiveness with which the Government can function.

No one can disagree with the principle that all public officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality, and complete devotion to the public interest. Moreover, this principle must be followed not only in reality but also in appearance. For Congress, this principle is especially important. Congressmen are the direct representatives of the people. And Congress is the source of the money and the authority on which the National Government depends.

Yet, there is an uncomfortable gap between principle and practice. Congress does not possess the unquestioned confidence or the high reputation for integrity it needs to have. People have doubts and suspicions. And much of the fault lies with Congress itself. For Congress has failed to police itself effectively. It has failed to establish clear-cut standards of conduct and to enforce these standards.

Two examples are very much in the news and they illustrate very well the problem we face. Congressman Adam Clayton Powell was denied his seat in the House on the first day of the new session, and the charges against him are now being investigated. I supported this move, but I must ask now, in common with many people, whether Congress will be content simply to dispose of the Powell case or whether it will establish the standards and machinery to assure that all its members are above reproach.

The other example is the Bobby Baker case. Mr. Baker has just been convicted on charges amounting to a violation of his trust as a former top employee of the Senate. The very evidence, however, which convicted Baker also implicated at least one former Senator in a situation involving the payment of nearly 100,000 dollars for the purpose of influencing legislation. Nothing, apparently, is being done about this.

People have a right to be bothered by unanswered questions like these. It's their government. And Congress has an obligation to the people, and to itself, to restore the people's confidence in this the highest institution of self government in our land.

Throughout my years in the House, I have repeatedly urged Congress to take the necessary action. Together with many of my colleagues, I have voted, introduced legislation, made speeches and testified before committees in efforts to bring about reform. The results, to date, have been meager, indeed. It's not because Congress doesn't know what

it ought to do; rather, it has lacked the will to do it. Now, however, in the face of renewed scandal, we have the best opportunity so far to remedy the situation.

For the past several weeks, I have been researching this matter carefully—reviewing what has been proposed, studying the conflict-of-interest regulations of the Executive Branch, and preparing legislation which will meet the problem squarely.

I believe we need to do the following things: require the disclosure of all assets and liabilities, gifts, and business interests of Members of Congress and their top staff assistants; place on the public record all communications between Congressmen and government agencies on behalf of private interests; write a Code of Ethics which will provide specific and meaningful standards of conduct; and establish a permanent committee in the House with the power to investigate allegations of improper conduct and the power to punish offenders.

This is what my legislation will provide. If Congress enacts these laws, most of our battle will be won. And for those who persist in violating ethical standards, we will have the means of dealing with him effectively.

THE WAR ON POVERTY IN MY HOMETOWN—A STUDY IN SCHIZOPHRENIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the schizoid activities of the Johnson administration in approaching the problems of poverty make the story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde relatively unimaginative. The mimeograph mills of the Great Society are constantly grinding out big slogan words like "massive attack," "bold and imaginative planning," which create the impression that poverty and the other evils which confront mankind are being rolled back before the forces of Federal law and Federal money. But when the time comes for some constructive action, I have learned from bitter experience that the Great Society frequently puts on a new face and looks the other way.

In Mexico there is a saying, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces." Literally, it means "Much noise and few nuts." Figuratively, it means "Much talk and little accomplishment."

A rather exotic Yankee philosopher, Yogi Berra, recently stated:

You can observe quite a lot just by looking.

Well, I have been looking at all the Federal Government has done about poverty in my own hometown and I have observed quite a lot and, in my opinion, it can be best expressed with the Mexican phrase, "Mucho ruido, pocas nueces."

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to give you a concrete example, documented in fact, of the schizoid actions of the Johnson administration in the last few days in my congressional district.

To set the stage, let us first take a look at my hometown of Gilroy, Calif. We are primarily an agricultural community in an area which is almost in a different economic world than the rest

of Santa Clara County. Because the fast-growing electronic and industrial complex of northern Santa Clara County has not yet come to the Gilroy area, we will probably be required to depend upon agriculture and food processing as our economic base for a few years to come.

This dependence creates serious unemployment problems since agricultural employment is highly seasonal. Furthermore, because it is a pleasant place to live, many migratory workers who travel across the State during the summer spend their winters in Gilroy. These people are underskilled and have not been fortunate enough to have received the training which would enable them to break their migratory pattern. Their lot admittedly is not the most pleasant. There is need to help them develop skills which are in demand and at the same time to develop jobs which they can fill.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has designated Gilroy as a "pocket of poverty." Two years ago a nationally televised report by the Columbia Broadcasting System held it up as an example of poverty in the midst of affluence.

According to figures taken from the Santa Clara County Special Census of April 1966, 41.7 percent of Gilroy families have an annual income of less than \$6,000, 23.5 percent get less than \$4,000, and 8.4 percent get less than \$2,000.

The Santa Clara County Welfare Department estimated early in January that more than 1,000 families are currently on the welfare rolls in the greater Gilroy area.

The State department of employment estimates that the level of employment fluctuates wildly throughout the year, with a low employment of 1,721 to a high of 7,926.

The Federal Government sends a parade of VISTA volunteers to Gilroy to assist migratory workers. The Gilroy Area Service Center of the Economic Opportunity Commission receives comparatively heavy financing in its efforts under the poverty program.

Though I wish I could claim differently, these facts show that we do have a problem in Gilroy. Constructive Federal help would be useful and welcome in meeting our peculiar economic problem.

As the remainder of my story will show, we took the constructive steps advocated by the deluge of paper and press releases which come from the mimeograph mills of Washington. We found a means of doing something constructive. We courted one branch of Government, we were encouraged, and then we were jilted.

At the same time, another branch of the Great Society continues to pipe its tune which leads people down a road of false hope, frustration, and continued poverty.

Last fall, Swift & Co. expressed an interest in establishing a meatpacking plant near Gilroy. I talked personally with Mr. J. A. Copeland, vice president of Swift & Co., who confirmed this interest.

The meatpacking plant would immediately employ 350 unskilled laborers who

would be furnished year-round employment at good wages. Here was an opportunity in one fell swoop to break the migratory and poverty pattern of 350 human beings for all time. And the anticipated growth of Swift & Co. would undoubtedly more than double their initial employee requirements.

But Swift & Co. had to be assured that adequate utilities could be furnished, the most crucial being a sewage treatment and disposal system to handle the large discharges that come from a meatpacking plant.

This situation appeared made to order for the grant and loan program authorized by Congress and administered by the Economic Development Administration. Gilroy was encouraged to submit its application and did so. I had numerous contacts with the Seattle Regional Office of the Economic Development Administration in an effort to expedite processing of this application and received courteous and efficient replies from Mr. V. W. Cameron, the area director. At one time, Mr. Cameron wrote, and I quote:

Since the Swift and Company project involves approximately 900 new jobs, its location may have considerable impact in our evaluation of this Gilroy application.

In the meantime, Swift & Co., anxious to make its decision and proceed with the construction of its new west coast facility, patiently marked time. The Seattle office of the Economic Development Administration acted expeditiously and I was finally informed that the application had been sent forward to Washington.

At this point, the old Washington run-around started to operate and political gobbledegook and doubletalk began. Twice I was informed by Washington Economic Development Administration officials that the application was still in Seattle. Upon checking there, I found on both occasions that the information from the Economic Development Administration in Washington was false. On one occasion, I was even told the name of the lady in Washington who had the application on her desk.

I pressed further and submitted a letter written to the city manager of Gilroy by Mr. John W. Nordstrom of Swift & Co., which said in part:

We cannot definitely state that if Gilroy is given the money for this sewage disposal plant that Swift and Company would build there, but we can say that Gilroy would not be considered for this plant if a sewage disposal facility is not available.

On February 6, I wrote a letter to Mr. Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director of Economic Development, enclosing a copy of Mr. Nordstrom's letter, in which I said:

Perhaps it is too much to expect the Federal Government to make an advance commitment conditioned upon Swift's action in this case. This being true, we are then faced with the situation of which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

It is my considered opinion that a conditional commitment on the part of the Federal Government should be made and the condition should be that the grant will be approved if and when an industry is attracted to Gilroy because of the grant which